

THE BC

AMERICAN

CATHOLIC QUARTERLY

REVIEW.

Bonum est homini ut eum veritas vincat volentem, quia malum est homini ut eum veritas vincat invitum. Nam ipsa vincat necesse est, sive negantem sive confitentem.

S. AUG. EPIST. CCXXXVIII. AD PASCENT.

VOLUME XIX.

FROM JANUARY TO OCTOBER, 1894.

BOSTON COLLEGE LIBRARY
CHESTNUT HILL, MASS.

PHILADELPHIA:
CHARLES A. HARDY,
PUBLISHER AND PROPRIETOR,
505 CHESTNUT STREET.

COPYRIGHT, 1894.

BY

CHARLES A. HARDY.

70759

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
HARNACK'S DOGMATIC HISTORY (Second Article). By <i>Very Rev. Augustine F. Hewit, D.D., C.S.P.</i> ,	1
The antithesis of Harnack's theory is continuity of Christian teaching, 1; The early date of the basis of our theory, 2; Our contention goes to the inmost heart of Christianity, 3; The best line of arguments concerning the person of Jesus Christ, 4; The one simple issue in the present contention, 6; Whatever Christ taught about Himself must be true, 7; Jesus Christ primarily the Son of God, 8; What He said of Himself, 10; The teaching of the Apostles as to the divinity of Christ, 12; Distinction of personality in the relation of the Son to the Father, 13; How the proof of Christ's divinity disposes of modern pseudo-criticism, 14; The principles of Christ's kingdom as announced by Himself, 15; Divine revelation the foundation of the Christian faith, 16; The Protestant theory of Christ's building of His church, 17; Sincerity and intelligence of the rulers of the Catholic Church, 18; The Bible not the sole and sufficient rule of faith, 19; Inheritance of the Catholic Episcopate from Jesus Christ, 21; A sufficient and adequate authority derived from God Himself, 22; The testimony obscured only by man's delinquencies, 23; What history teaches at this point, 24.	
UNIVERSITY COLLEGES; THEIR ORIGIN AND THEIR METHODS (Concluded). By <i>Brother Azarias</i> ,	25
The guide books by which the masters were directed in their teachings, 25; Education as discussed by a mediæval man of practical sense, 26; William Perault's manual of pedagogy, 27; Qualities of the good student and his studies, 28; Further illustrations of the educational spirit of the Dominicans, 30; The Franciscans as teachers—Roger Bacon, 32; Bonvicino da Ripa, 33; Dante summed up what was best in the educational methods of his day, 35; The language of the people made the vehicle of spiritual thought by the Franciscans, 38.	
BROTHER AZARIAS.—THRENODY. By <i>Rev. Hugh T. Henry</i> ,	39
ST. GREGORY THE GREAT AND ENGLAND. By <i>Michael Hennessy</i> ,	40
Forsaking worldly greatness for the cloister, 40; Gregory's first inspiration in behalf of Britain, 41; Chosen to guide the bark of Peter, 42; The vast moral influence of a great man of stainless character, 43; Character of the inhabitants of Britain whom he wished to evangelize, 44; Difficulties only stimulated his zeal, 46; Arrival in Thanet of the first missionaries sent by him, 47; First fruits of the mission, 48; Joy of the Holy Father at his emissaries' success, 49; He develops greater strength as the occasion requires it, 50; His keen conception of the essential and the accidental, 51; His fidelity to the leader of his English mission, 52; Answers to calumnies of well-known historians, 53; The foundation of the Anglo-Saxon Church not his only great work, 54; Carrying out the precepts of the Gospel in behalf of the poor and oppressed, 55; The great Pope the corner-stone of both the Church and the state in England, 56.	
THE CHURCH AND THE EMPIRE, A D. 250-312. By <i>Rev. Thomas J. Shahan, D.D.</i> ,	57
Condition of the Church when the edicts of Nicomedia were issued, 57; A point reached when the opposing claims of Christ and Cæsar must be settled, 58; Causes of Decius's hostility to Christianity, 60; The numerical strength of the Church in the west at that time, 61; Its condition in the East, 64; Outside agencies tending to the spread of Christianity, 69; Constituents of the Christian society, 70; Causes of the rapid spread of Christianity—proselytism, 71; Examples of proselytizing zeal, 73; How Christian slaves helped in the apostolate, 75; Corporate union of Christians, 76; Organizing "colleges" so as to gain a legal status, 78; Constitution, regulations and work of these semi-legal meetings, 79.	
HONORIUS AND LIBERIUS, PONTIFFS. By <i>Arthur F. Marshall, B.A. (Oxon.)</i> ,	82
Anglican flaw-picking in Catholic history, 82; Pope Honorius did not teach and was never accused of teaching heresy, 83; Disputed points in regard to the scandal about Honorius, 84; The Pope and the Sixth General Council, 85; Pope Leo II. and the decrees of this Council, 86; Honorius condemned merely for his feeble wish to temporize under difficulties, 87; Dr. Dollinger on the case of Pope Liberius, 88; The nature of the difficulty with Liberius, 89; Fallibility of history and the infallibility of the Pope, 90; The case of both Popes settled forever by the Vatican Council, 91; Demonstrating the weakness of objections against Papal infallibility, 92.	
THE GARDEN OF BALSAM. By <i>A. R. Dowling, F.R.S.</i> ,	93
Tradition's tribute to a supposed place of sojourn of the Holy Family in Egypt, 93; The journey from Cairo to Heliopolis, 94; Scenes of interest along the way, 95; Significance of Christ's early visit to Egypt, 97; Matariyeh and the Garden of Balsam, 98; The tree said to have shaded the Holy Family, 99; Legends connected with the tree, 100; The holy well, 101; Records left by the ancient pil-	

102

grims, 102; The church at the famous site, 103; Significant emblem on the Hill of Frankincense in a Moslem land, 104; The balsam that gave the garden its title, 105; Its connection with one of the gifts received by Solomon, 106; a peculiar shrub of the neighborhood, 107; The high esteem in which it was ever held, 108, Thoughts awakened by the associations of Matariyeh, 109; Continual charm of the traditional stories, 111.

OUR CONVERTS, PART II. By *Richard H. Clarke, LL.D.*, 112

Mrs. Seton, 112; Fanny Allen, 113; The Barber Family, 114; Archbishop Whitfield, 116; Archbishop Eccleston and Bishop Tyler, 117; Bishop Young, 118; Archbishop Bayley, 119; General Rosecrans, 120; Bishop Rosecrans and Archbishop Wood, 121; Father Preston and Bishop Gilmour, 123; Bishop Wadhams, 124; Bishop Curtis, 125; Father Hecker, 126; Miss Starr, 128; Dr. Brownson, 129; James A. McMaster, 130; Dr. Ives, 131; Father Fidelis Kent Stone, 32; Books written by converts, 133; Converted Indians—Catharine Togakouita, 138.

HAWAII AND ITS MISSIONARIES. By *Bryan J. Clench*, 139

How the change from barbarism to civilization has affected different peoples, 139; European exploration and influence in the islands of the Pacific Ocean, 140; Hospitality of the Polynesian Islanders, 141; Malign influence of the first white visitors to Hawaii, 142; Failure of Protestantism to spread Christianity among the heathen, 143; The first American Protestant missionaries in Hawaii, 144; Conflicts of the natives with foreign sailors, 145; The beginning of Catholic mission work in Hawaii obstructed by Protestants, 146; A temporary relief soon followed by the restoration of the Protestant penal code, 147; Return of the exiled priests and relaxation of the anti-Catholic violence, 148; Protestant ministers turn to politics, 149; Disastrous results of Protestantism in Hawaii, 151; Contrasted with Catholic influence in Polynesia, 152; What the Protestant missionaries in Hawaii have succeeded in doing, 153.

THE TRUE ACCOUNT OF THE MURDER OF ARCHBISHOP SEGHERS, 154

Foundation of the Catholic mission in Alaska, 154; Archbishop Seghers returns to the mission, 155; a toilsome journey to the head waters of the Yukon, 156; Voyaging in strange and dangerous waters, 157; The party divided, 158; Fuller becomes morose and complains of the Archbishop, 159; The Archbishop's last camp, 160; The fatal gun-shot, 161; Starting with the body to St. Michael's, 162; The body deposited in the old Russian church there, 163; Fuller at St. Michael's and Andreieffski, 164; Movements of Fathers Tosi and Robaut, 165; Fuller arrested and the Archbishop's body removed to Victoria, 166; The place where the murder was committed, 167; A pilgrimage to the scene in 1892, 168.

THE TRUTH CONCERNING THE DISENFRANCHISEMENT OF CATHOLICS IN RHODE ISLAND. By *John Richard Meade*, 169

Religious toleration in Rhode Island and in Maryland, 169; Roger Williams and toleration, 170; Supposed origin of the fiction of intolerance, 171; Not questioned until 1818, and then by a Catholic, 172; Examining the digests of laws, 173; Arguments against the likelihood of the intolerance amendment, 175; Anti-Catholic laws in England, but not in Rhode Island, 176.

✓ **DE STUDIIS SCRIPTURAE SACRAE LEO PP. XIII.** (Encyclical "Providentissimus Deus"), 177

SCIENTIFIC CHRONICLE. By *Rev. Thomas J. A. Freeman, S.J.*, 198

Money, 198; The science of mechanics, 207; Transparent leather, 215; Sugar from cotton seed, 216.

THE COMING KINGDOM OF CHRIST. By *Very Rev. Augustine F. Hewit, D.D., C.S.P.*, 225

The future for the Catholic Church, which is Christ's kingdom, 225; Is the kingdom of Antichrist passing away? 226; The darkness before the dawn of a brighter day, 227; The prophecies of the Apocalypse, 228; Has Antichrist come already, or is he yet to come? 229; Outbreaks of evil in the past regarded only as precursors of the real Antichrist, 230; New Testament prophecies in plain language concerning him, 231; The epoch in which to look for the manifestation of Antichrist, 233; His coming as believed to have been foretold by the prophet Daniel, 234; Mohammed and Antichrist, 235; Scriptural teaching that the world belongs to God, 236; Prophecy of the ultimate conversion of the Jewish people to Christ, 237; And of the entire Gentile world, 239; Pope Pius IX. and the prospect of the approaching triumph of the Church, 240; Bad and careless Christians the worst enemies of the Church's extension, 241; The recent great change for the better in the condition and prospects of the Catholic Church, 242; The little that now remains to be accomplished, 243.

THE TRANSFER OF THE INDIAN BUREAU TO THE WAR DEPARTMENT. By *General John Gibbon, U. S. A.*, 244

The story of the contact of the whites with the red men, 244; An incident illustrating the cause of the Indian's condition, 245; Barbarous "pioneers of civilization," 246; Indians' confidence in a white man, 247; The War Department and Indian agencies prior to 1849, 248; Failure not always due to the agents, 249; Origin of the recent demand for giving the Indians to the War Department, 250; Army officers made inspectors, 251; The original evils aggravated under the Interior Department, 252; Difference between the army system and the Indian Bureau system, 253; In what the army system consists, 254; False charges made against the army, 255; Changes that have taken place in the Indians' surroundings, 256; Even greater changes in the Bureau itself, 257; The army system the more perfect, 259.

THE AGE OF THE HUMAN RACE ACCORDING TO MODERN SCIENCE AND BIBLI-

CAL CHRONOLOGY. Part IV. By *Rev. J. A. Zahm, C. S. C.*, 260

The antiquity of man according to the Bible, 260; Obstacles encountered by the chronologist, 261; The chief ones worth mentioning, 262; The chronology of the Septuagint *versus* that of the Hebrew, 263; The various data for fixing the time of the creation of Adam, 264; Gaps in genealogical records, 265; The Bible not decisive on the antiquity of our race, 266; Is the Church's teaching on inspiration controverted? 267; It has so far been proof against modern science, 268; The age of our race decided by neither Scripture nor science, 269; Opinions of leading Catholic specialists, 270; The question belongs to history rather than to natural science, 271; The vagaries of the human intellect illustrated by this question, 272.

THE REVOCATION OF THE EDICT OF NANTES. By *Rev. Reuben Parsons, D.D.*, 273

Foolish talk of the American Huguenot associations, 273; The "Reformers" in France, 274; Their crooked course in politics and war, 275; De Thou's admissions, 277; From the Edict of Nantes to its revocation, 278; Causes of the latter act and the alleged damage it did to France, 279; Did France lose immense wealth by the emigration of the Huguenots? 281; How the manufacturing interests were affected, 282; The emigration produced very little effect on the country, 284; Madame de Maintenon and the Huguenots, 285.

IRISH SAINTS IN ITALY. By *Ellen M. Clarke*, 286

Peculiar relation of early Christian Ireland towards the Church, 286; Developments of devotion in those times 287; Disasters to the Church in northern Italy in the sixth century, 288; Miss Stokes's explanations, 289; Religious memories among lovely scenery, 290; St. Finnian's work continued by St. Columbanus, 291; King Agilulph's pledge to the latter, 292; End of the great apostle's career, 293; His fellow-laborers in the same vineyard, 294; How much Italy owes to her Irish apostles, 296.

SCIENTIFIC EDUCATION, EXACT AND INEXACT. By *Rev. Thomas Hughes, S.J.* 297

Modern conditions call for a thorough preparatory training, 297; Competition is good only when it is real, 298; Too much "science" in our pedagogical instruction, 299; There is now a swarm of books on "scientific education," 300; A true liberal education for a boy's mind, 301; Outcome of modern pedagogics in popular education, 302; The place of the exact sciences, 303; Where and how mathematical methods may do harm, 305; Their influence in bringing about the revolutionary state of modern society, 306; The true scientific spirit is not irreligious, 307; The utilitarian fallacy and the infidel tendency, 309; Wherein popular education has failed, 310; Universal education and improvements in social condition, 311; President Eliot's gloomy view of popular education, 313; Outcome of the new pedagogics, 315; A constructive view of sound education, 316; A Wisconsin theorizer examined, 317; What belongs to the practical conduct of education, 318; A good system to avoid, 319.

GOUNOD AND CHURCH MUSIC By *Rev. Hugh T. Henry*, 330

A special view of an engaging picture, 320; Gounod's place in Church Music, 321; The obscurity which shrouds his sacred music, 323; His place as a dramatic artist, 324; Latitude of the term "sacred music," 326; The basis of Gounod's reputation in ecclesiastical circles, 327; His two principal "Masses," 328; Did not develop his themes in fugue form, 330; His "Orphonistes" Masses, 332; The "Messe à Jeanne d'Arc," 334; The spirit animating Gounod's work, 335; His tone-painting, 336; His sacred compositions besides the Masses, 338; "Meditations" on Bach's "Preludes," 340; An estimate of his style as a musician, 341; His character reflected in his work, 343; His training supplemented by his natural abilities, 344; A protest against adverse criticism, 345; The "sensual beauty of music," 346; Gounod's music both sensual and intellectual, 347.

MARSHAL MACMAHON; THE SOLDIER AND THE MAN. By *Very Rev. J. Hogan, S.S., D.D.*, 348

A brave soldier's place in the hearts of the French people, 348; MacMahon's share in the great events of his country's history, 349; First and before all a soldier, 350; What a true call to the life of a soldier implies, 351; His beginnings in the military career, 352; His great achievement in the Crimean war, 353; From the Crimea back to Algeria, 355; Reaching the acme of his military career in the Italo-Austrian war, 356; The Franco-German war of 1870, 357; The reverses of 1870, 358; Disaster of Sedan, 359; The Paris Communal outbreak of 1871, 361; He becomes president of the French Republic, 362; a soldier, not a statesman, 363; Retirement to private life, 364; In private life, 365; Close of his career, 366.

L'ANCIEN RÉGIME. Part II. By *Prof. St. George Mivart, F.R.S.*, 368

Revolutionary and reactionary struggles in the French provinces, 368; The mass of the people passive, 369; Local revolts paralyzing the central power, 370; That of Brittany, 371; Both power and prestige lost to royalty, 372; Increase of disorder on this account, 373; Inactivity of the reputable citizens, 374; Local assemblages and unjust taxation, 375; Disloyalty of the privileged classes to the king, 376; These classes responsible for the revolution, 377; The province of Dauphiné and Philippe Egalité, 378; Troubles in Franche-Comté also, 380; Languedoc, 381; Exceptional administration of Provence, 382; Preparing for the opening of the States General, 384; The Commons treated with indignity from the beginning, 385; The king his own betrayer, 386; Tyrants among the people as well as among kings, 387.

	PAGE
THE STUDY OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES. By <i>His Holiness Pope Leo XIII.</i> (Translation of the Encyclical "Providentissimus Deus"),	388
God's gift to man, 388; Holy Scriptures most profitable to doctrine and morality, 389; What the Bible owes to the Catholic Church, 392; How to study Holy Scripture, 395; Holy Scripture and theology, interpretation, the Fathers, 398; The authority of Holy Scripture, modern criticism, physical science, 403; Inspiration incompatible with error, 406; Summary, 409.	
THE POPE AND THE SCRIPTURES. By <i>Rev. James Conway, S.J.</i> ,	412
A self-styled "Catholic's" objections, 412; Only a plagiarist from rationalist and agnostic sources 413; What the Encyclical really says, 414; Character of the enemies with whom the Bible student of to-day has to contend, 415; The scope enjoyed by the Catholic commentator, 416; The Scriptures as the chief source of the theological arguments, 417; The use the student of Scripture can make of the natural sciences, 418; The duty of the Catholic scholar to defend the Scriptures, 419; Points of doctrine reaffirmed in the Encyclical, 420; The Scriptures as the communications of God to man, 421; What is needed to make a document an inspired writing, 422; Starting point of the Holy Father's Encyclical, 423; Inspiration as limited by some Catholics, 424; Strict orthodoxy against <i>obiter dicta</i> , 425; The Pope and "advanced criticism," 426; The use of the Latin Vulgate, 427; The universal canon of interpretation, 428; The criteria laid down by the Pope, 429; The Encyclical a document most progressive in recommendations and enforcements, 431; The spirit that pervades the Encyclical, 432.	
IN MEMORIAM: GEORGE DERING WOLFF, A.M., LL D.,	433
SCIENTIFIC CHRONICLE. By <i>Rev. Thomas J. A. Freeman, S.J.</i> ,	434
Salt and its manufacture, 434; Figurative meanings of salt, 436; The word "salt" among the chemists, 437; Composition of common salt and its properties, 438; Sources of salt and its manufacture, 441.	
DOM GASQUET AS A HISTORIAN. By <i>A. M. Grange</i> ,	449
The task Father Gasquet has set himself to accomplish, 449; In studying the causes of the "Reformation" he has done a great service to general history, 450; Results of the Black Death in both social and religious life, 451; Three distinct epochs of Anglicanism, 453; Henry VIII's divorce and the English schism, 454; Spoilation of the religious houses, 455; Dom Gasquet's method of narrating facts, 456; Indignation of the people at the suppression of the monasteries, 457; Schism and robbery went together, 458; Heresy treading close on the heels of schism, 459; Changed conditions under Edward VI., 460; Origin of the Book of Common Prayer, 461; The English people exasperated at the change, 462; The chasm opened between modern Anglicanism and the former Church of England, 463; Religious anarchy in England, 464.	
ANCIENT KELTIC LITERATURE. By <i>Rev. T. J. Shahan, D.D.</i> ,	465
Origin and primitive movements of the Keltic race, 465; The first settlers in Europe, they were pressed hard between the Teutons and the Romans, 467; Literature of the heroic period of the Keltic race, 469; The Druids of Gaul, 470; Holding their last refuge in the British Islands, 471; The Armorican Kelts have preserved but little of their literature, 472; Only the Irish and the Welsh possess an ancient literature, 473; King Arthur only the ideal of Keltic manhood and ambition, 474; The Irish the most important branch of the Keltic literature, 475; It covers a period of two thousand years, 476; Where the ancient Irish literature is found, 477; Why the invention of printing was of so little benefit to it, 478; How the mediæval Irish preserved their literature, 479; Comparatively little known of what the ancient Irish literature contains, 480; A view of the historical literature of the Kelts' annals, 481; Genealogies and pedigrees, 485; Historic tales, 488; The Homeric days of the Gael, 490.	
THE LATEST PHASES OF PANTHEISTIC EVOLUTION. By <i>Rev. John J. Ming, S.J.</i> ,	492
Cause of disagreement among evolutionary philosophers, 492; Philosophic theories among the ancient Greeks, 493; Revival of pantheism in the modern world, 494; Intellectual influence of Lotze and Fechner in the English-speaking world, 495; Wallace's speculation, 496; Emerson's theory of the divine world-soul, 497; Both pantheistic and evolutionary, 499; His tenets re-echoed by Bixby, 500; Martineau's theory of the way God works in the world, 501; Schurmann's further explanation, 502; His theory makes the visible universe to consist of particles separated from God, 505; Can these resuscitated ancient systems help modern evolution? 507.	
RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION. By <i>A. F. Marshall, B.A. (Oxon)</i> ,	508
The principle of persecution and the Spanish Inquisition, 508; Object of the Inquisition and religious persecution, 509; The St. Bartholomew massacre, 510; What the Pope did in regard to it, 511; The Galileo controversy, 512; Persecution of Catholics by Protestants, 513; Political aspect of persecutions, 514; Essential difference in the character of persecutions by Catholics and by Protestants, 516; That by Catholics was never more severe than the common law against criminals, 517; Protestant approval of the persecution of noisy apostates, 518; summing up of principle and fact on both sides, 519.	
THE GROWTH AND SPIRIT OF MODERN PSYCHOLOGY. By <i>Rev. E. A. Pace, D.D.</i> ,	522
What goes on in a psychological laboratory, 522; Is the new science a finer form of materialism? 523; Nature of the problems which modern psychology attempts to solve, 524; Can psychology become an exact science, 526; Influence of biological	

Table of Contents.

vii

PAGE

research, 527; An apt motto for psychological investigation, 528; Fechner's psycho-physical theory, 529; Methodical procedure necessary to it, 531; The basis of Minot's theory of psychology, 532; Testing the methods of the new science, 533; What it has accomplished, 534; Phenomena but instances of a more general law, 536; First step towards solving a problem after defining it, 537; The essential requisites of successful work, 538; analysis of sense perceptions, 539; Study of attention and succession of mental states, 540; The time-sense, 541; Feelings and emotions, 542; Principles that even the specialist in psychology cannot dispense with, 544.

INDIAN BIBLIOGRAPHIES (second article). By *Richard R. Elliott*, 545

Deep interest of the bibliography of the Algonquin languages, 545; The enormous number of titles it contains, 546; Nations of the confederacy represented in Mr. Pilling's compilation, 547; What his chronological index discloses, 548; Records of the French explorations and missions, 549; Some of the Jesuit "Relations," 552; Lahontan and Charlevoix, 553; A sad blow to the Algonquin Confederacy, 554; Some curious entries, 555; Father La Brosse's missions, 556; Suppression of the Jesuits, 557; The British Government and the Catholic missionaries, 558; Bishop Briand coerced by the government, 559; The Dutch and other documents, 560.

HIGHER CRITICISM AND THE BIBLE. By *Rev Charles P. Grannan, D.D.*, 562

Object of the science of Biblical Introduction, 562; What "Lower Criticism" is taken to mean, 564; "Higher Criticism" does not necessarily discredit the Bible, 565; Definition and object of it, 566; Human co-operation with the Divine work in Scripture, 567; Duty of the critic in ascertaining genuinity and integrity, 569; Veracity of the Scriptures and their literary method, 570; On what the "higher critics" depend to show joint authorship of the same book, 571; Uncertainty of the conclusions of literary analysis, 572; All higher criticism is not destructive, 573; Various attitudes of the "higher criticism" towards Christianity, 574; The historian's treatment of Scripture, 575; The "Higher Critics" "silence" arguments, 576; Anti-Christian theories of the origin of the Christian religion, 577; The prejudice against the critic in favor of the Scriptures, 578; And against the supernatural, 579; No good results to be expected from the false principles of higher critics, 580; Discordant hypotheses of the "Higher Critics," 581.

THE MAID OF ORLEANS AND THE NEW WOMANHOOD. By *Isabel M. O'Reilly*, 582

Joan of Arc and the rightful bounds of woman's sphere, 582; Twofold influence of the Church in social problems, 583; Characteristics of the Maid of Orleans, 584; The key to the marvels of her eventful life, 586; Her life always that of the ideal girl, 587; The guiding star of her career, 588; The supernatural in her marvellous achievements, 589; The widest possible range in woman's sphere, 590; Condition of France in the fifteenth century, 591; Joan sets out on her military career, 592; Convincing the people of her special mission, 593; Devotional features of her life in camp and field, 594; The greatest safeguard of a woman leading a manly life, 595; Is glory deified egotism, 596; Final scenes in the life of our heroine, 597; Betrayed at Compiègne, 598; Imprisoned and tortured at Rouen, 599; Her condemnation, 600; Her sublime words on facing death, 601; Unselfishness of her glorious career, 602; Reparation to the saintly maid, 603; Her position in reference to the Church, 604; Woman cannot improve on the ideal found in her, 605; The prospect of Joan of Arc on our altars, 606.

PETRARCH AND THE CARTHUSIANS. By *A. E. W.*, 607

Florence, Italy, and the Petrarch family, 607; Petrarch and the companions of his early days, 608; Society at Avignon in his time, 609; Foundation of the Carthusian monastery of Montrieux, 610; A journey to the Grande Chartreuse, 611; Back to Italy, 612; Honored on account of his Carthusian brother, 613; Taking up a retired residence near Milan, 614; A characteristic letter from Petrarch to the Carthusian Father-General, 615; Petrarch a canon of the Lombes Cathedral, 616; Extraordinary communications during sleep, 617; Petrarch's view of the sojourn of the Popes at Avignon, 618; Petrarch and Pope Gregory XI., 619.

THE SCRIPTURES IN EARLY CHRISTIAN ART. By *Rt. Rev. Robert Seton, D.D.* 620

Character of early Christian art essentially hieratic, 620; St. John Damascene and the Iconoclasts, 622; Biblical subjects in early Christian art, 624; The Scriptures themselves, not any scenes from them, represented, 626; How special Biblical scenes were treated, 628.

GIVE US A TERMINOLOGY. By *Rev. William Poland, S.J.*, 629

Words have different meanings in different schools of philosophy, 629; The result is an appalling confusion, 630; Illustrating the difficulties a philosopher has to struggle with, 631; A sample definition for the ordinary educated man, 632; Philosophy needs an "Academy" to fix the meanings of words, 633; What its formal work would be, 634; A great work yet ahead for men of genius, 635.

SCIENTIFIC CHRONICLE. By *Rev. Thomas J. A. Freeman, S.J.*, 637

Money and how to make it, 637; Marking, stamping, and coining it, 640; Date of first coinage, 641; Coining by casting, 643; Prehistoric, 644; Historic times in the United States, 647; The old mint, 648; The new mint, 649; Other mints in the United States, 650; Work of the various divisions of the mint, 651; The Cabinet, 655.

THE NEWEST DARWINISM. By *Prof. St. George Mivart, F.R.S.*, 673

The evolution theory of the last century, 673; What epigenesis really is, 674; Darwin and Lamarck's theory of the origin of new species, 675; Weismann's "immortality of organisms," 676; His germ-plasm, 677; Changes difficult to account for by mere accident, 678; The process of development in the frog as an instance,

679; There is no biological "undesigned coincidence," 680; Weismann's theory precludes change in the adult structure, 681; Instances of plant structure seemingly in conflict with the theory of "natural selection," 682; Darwin against Darwin, 683; True and false evolution and epigenesis, 684; Explanations of the modern scientists naturally unsatisfactory, 685; The proper explanation, 686; What immaterial energy does, 687; A study needing thorough research in order to bring reward, 688; Darwin's natural selection the basis of Weismann's theory, 689; A final protest against a common error, 690.

TESTIMONY OF THE GREEK CHURCH TO ROMAN SUPREMACY. By *Very Rev.*

Augustine F. Hewit, C. S. P., 691

What is here meant by the Greek Church, 691; the Pope's various titles and jurisdictions, 692; Origin and use of metropolitans in the Church, 693; How the Pope exercised the superior metropolitan jurisdiction, 694; Designations that easily lend themselves to un-Catholic usage, 695; The schismatic Greek Church as an excuse for Protestants, 696; Supremacy the one question now at issue, 697; Significance of the primacy having been universally recognized in the East, 698; Explanation of the transfer of the centre of Christianity from the East to the West, 699; Political importance of cities and ecclesiastical dignities, 701; A change made necessary by the circumstances after St. Peter's death, 702; Papal supremacy did not originate in ambition, 703; The unity of the Catholic Church is a wonderful and unique phenomenon, 704; Why Rome became the centre of Christendom, 705; the adequate cause and sufficient reason for the Pope's rank, 706; The Eastern Church formally acknowledged the Pope's supremacy until the eleventh century, 708; The history of the Eastern Church is a witness against Protestantism, 711.

"WHO IS MY MOTHER?" By *Rev. Joseph V. Tracy,* 712

A much controverted text of Scripture, and the questions it gives rise to, 712; The comments of the Fathers, 713; Language of these writers that the Catholics of to-day would not use, 714; More favorable patristic comment, 716; Treatment of the subject by the later Fathers, 717; Criticism of the passage since the sixteenth century, 718; Modern Catholic Scripturists, 719; Abbé Fillon as a representative of the exegesis of to-day, 720; Cardinal Newman's exposition, 721; Difficulties in the various explanations, 722; An attempt to solve them, 723; The light in which the text under consideration should be read, 724; Christ's relations with His Mother and brethren, 726; An examination of two other cognate texts, 728; Misrepresenting the expositions of the early Church; 730; Archbishop Trench's unfairness, 732; Analysis of a famous question, 733; Only a purely reasonable service here rendered to the Mother of God, 735.

CRITICISM OF RECENT PANTHEISTIC EVOLUTION. By *Rev. John J. Ming, S. J.,* 736

Pantheism perverts the conception of the Godhead into an absurdity, 736; Its theories repugnant to evolution, 737; Incompetent to explain the process of evolution, 738; Is the world it would have finite or infinite? 739; It does not interpret evolution, nor explain unity, 741; It leads consistently to destruction, 743; The philosophy of modern pantheism, 745; Attempts to unriddle its perplexities, 746; Difficulties that beset the modern theory, 748; Attempt of some Protestant theologians to disentangle it from its difficulties, 750; Pantheism has signally failed in upholding evolution, 751; Pantheism does not enlighten Christianity, 752.

"I WILL THINK UPON RAHAB." By *Alfred E. P. Raymond Dowling, B.A. (Oxon.),* 754

The interest that Lower Egypt should have for us, 754; Historic associations of the neighborhood of Alexandria, 755; Character of the country, 756; The island on which Alexandria is built, 757; Scenes that no traveller can ever forget, 758; Composite character of Alexandria, 759; A few names that naturally suggest themselves in connection with it, 760; The last of Alexandrian rulers, 761; Points of interest and antiquity abound in the neighborhood, 763; The mosque of the 1001 columns, 764; The Church of St. Mark, 765; A home of almost all the schools of thought in the Christian Church, 767; The place from which Diocletian issued his edict of persecution, 768; A plea for the Copts of to-day, 769.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS TO THE POPE'S ENCYCLICAL. By *His Eminence James Cardinal Gibbons,* 771

The two recent appeals for religious unity, 771; What is necessary for unity of faith and religion, 772; The Holy Father's appeal for Christian union, 773; The Church misrepresented by those outside her pale, 775; Pope Leo's call should be attentively considered, 776.

THE ENCYCLICAL LETTER TO THE RULERS AND NATIONS OF THE WORLD CALLING FOR THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM, 777

PSYCHOLOGY, PHYSIOLOGY AND PEDAGOGICS. By *Rev. Thomas Hughes, S. J.,* 790

Traditional meaning of the names given above, 790; Elevated position of the human person in the visible universe, 792; the functions of the five subjects of physiology, 793; The debts we owe to modern physiology, 794; The new psychology served up by the school of empirical physiology, 795; How modern psychology is expounded, 796; Modern methods anticipated in the fourteenth century by Burdan, 787; Six leading heads of arguments, 797-801; Pedagogics in the new philosophic system, 802; Hygiene and pathology, 803; Applications of psychology in education, 805; A kindergarten of higher education, 806; Has the child never been known until these later times? 809; Child study as the basis of exact education, 810; Pedagogical psychology extravagantly absurd, 812.

THE SUPERNATURAL AND ITS IMITATIONS. By *A. F. Marshall, B.A. (Oxon.)*, 813

The first characteristic of Christianity as of divine origin, 813; The beginning of things before creaturship as we know of it, 814; Nature and the expectation of the supernatural, 815; Supernatural character of the whole history of Judaism, 816; The supernatural in Christianity, 817; Objections for the opponents of the supernatural to answer, 818; Facts of the supernatural, 819; Why people have such a hazy idea of the supernatural, 820; The treatment of mysticism as an illustration, 821; The preternatural the worst of all imitations, 823; Strength of the Roman Catholic position, 824; Intimations of the divine supernatural insights granted to the eye, 825; Questioning of the supernatural should be made outside the Church, 826.

A CHRISTIAN SOLDIER. By *T. L. L. Teling*, 827

General de Sonis and the banner of the Sacred Heart, 827; His birth, family and early years, 828; His young life receives its first touch of romance, 829; Relation of Algeria to France, 830; Profession of Catholicity in the barrack room and on the field, 831; Illustrating the strength of his example, 832; The Trappists in Algeria, 833; The happy life of a Christian military family in Africa, 834; In the Italian campaign of 1859, 835; A brief term of peace, 836; Interruptions of tranquility in Algeria, 837; Outbreak of the Franco-German war, 838; De Sonis and De Charette, 839; The former's distinguished services in 1879, 840; Glorious record of the Zouaves, 841; The battle of Patay, 843; De Sonis wounded in action, 845; Recovering from his wounds, 846; A Jesuit's impressions of him, 847; Complimenting De Charette's Zouaves, 848; De Sonis too good a Christian to be popular with the Radical Republic, 849; Edifying close of his noble career, 850.

SCIENTIFIC CHRONICLE. By *Rev. Thomas J. A. Freeman, S.J.*, 851

Oil, 851; The thing, 852; What a glyceride is, 853; Physical properties of oils, 854; Sources and classification of oils and fats, 855; Olive oil and how it is prepared, 856; Gallipoli and almond oils, 858; Peanut oil, 859; Colza oil, 860; Cottonseed oil, 861; Sunflower seed oil, 863; Linseed oil, 864; Walnut oil and the castor oil group, 865; The palm and cocoanut oil groups, 866; The tallow group, 868; Liquid land animal fats, 870; The whale and other marine animal oils, 871.

BOOK NOTICES.

	PAGE		PAGE
Angelus Domini, with Legendary Lays and poems, etc.	447	Life of Blessed Anthony Baldinucci, S.J. By Rev. Francis Goldie, S.J.	885
Aus Welt und Kirche. Dr. Franz Hettinger.	448	Life of St. Francis Borgia, S.J. By A. M. Clerke	884
Belief in the Divinity of Jesus Christ. By Father Didon, O. P.	873	Life of St. Philip Neri. By Cardinal Capelatro	672
Bible, Science and Faith. By Rev. J. A. Zahn, C.S.C.	892	Life of the Princess Borghese (née Talbot). By Chevalier Zeloni	672
Bibliotheca Theologiae et Philosophiae Scholasticae Selecta atque Composita. A Francisco Ehrle, S.J.	650	Logica. Auctore Carolo Frick, S.J.	656
Blessed Gerard Majella. C.S.S.R.	224	Manuel du Prêtre aux États-Unis. By Rt. Rev. L. de Goesbriand	448
Cæremoniæ Missarum Sol. et Pontif. etc. By G. Schober, C.S.S.R.	896	Mediaeval Records and Sonnets. By Aubrey de Vere	221
Carmina Mariana. By Orby Shipley, M.A.	672	Melodies of Mood and Tense. By Chas. H. A. Esling	888
Comedy of English Protestantism. By A. F. Marshall	447	Metaphysica. By Alamanno and Bringmann	656
Conclave, Le. Origine, Histoire, etc. Par Lucius Lector	671	Miniatures from Vatican Manuscripts. By Rev. S. Beissel, S.J.	217
Confessor After God's Own Heart. By Rev. L. J. M. Cros, S.J.	448	Missæ Romanæ, etc.	895
Cursus Philosophicus in Usum Scholarum, etc.; Logica, Rev. C. Frick, S.J.; Philosophia Naturalis, Rev. Henrico Haan, S.J.	448	Monastery of the Grande Chartreuse. Anon.	672
Cursus Philos. in Usum Scholarum Exactensis et Stonyhurstensis, S.J.	656	Monumenta Germaniæ Pedagogica. By Karl Kerbach	890
Dante's Divina Commedia: Its Scope and Value. By Franz Hettinger and H. S. Bowden	669	Nature of the State. By Paul Carus	893
Das Apostolische Glaubensbekenntnis. By Clemens Blume, S.J.	667	Neutestamentliche Schriftcanon und Clemens von Alexandrien. By Dr. P. Dausch	896
Data of Modern Ethics Examined. By Rev. John J. Ming, S.J.	664	Novum Testamentum Græce et Latine. Edited by Fr. Brandschied	670
Dawn of Italian Independence. By W. R. Thayer	224	Occasional Essays. By Rt. Rev. F. S. Chatard, D.D.	896
Diseases of Personality. By Th. Ribot	666	Occasional Sermons, and Lectures. By Rev. J. M. Kiely	895
Diseases of the Will. By Th. Ribot	889	Old and New Lights on Columbus. By R. H. Clarke, LL.D.	219
Elementary Course of Christian Philosophy. By Brother Louis of Poissy	223	Ontologia. Auctore Carolo Frick, S.J.	656
Étude sur le Grec du Nouveau Testament. Par Rev. Jos. Viteau	448	Philosophia Lacensis: Institutiones Theodiæ, secundum Principia S. Thomæ Aquinatis. By Rev. Jos. Hontheim, S.J.	446
Examination of Weismannism. By G. J. Romanes	448, 661	Philosophia Naturalis. Auctore Henr. Haan, S.J.	656
First Divorce of Henry VIII. By Mrs. Hope and Rev. Dr. Gasquet, O.S.B.	879	Primitive Church and the See of Peter. By Rev. Luke Rivington	668
Geschichte des Alten Testaments. By Dr. Æmilian Schöpfer	221	Purgatory Illustrated by the Lives and Legends of the Saints. By F. X. Schouppe, S.J.	663
Geschichte des Deutschen Volkes, etc. Vol. VII. By Johannes Jannsen	565	Religious Forces of the United States. By H. K. Carroll	659
History of the Church in England. By Mary H. Allies	881	St. Thomas's Priory: or, The Story of St. Austin's, Stafford. By J. Gillou	672
Holy Scripture for the Use of Catechists and Teachers. By Rev. F. J. Knecht, D.D.	886	Summa Philosophiæ ex Variis Libris D. Thomæ Aquinatis, etc. A Cosmo Alamanno, S.J., et Augustino Bringmann, S.J.	656
Illustrated Catholic Family Annual for 1894	224	The Beloved Disciple. By Rev. Father Rawes, D.D.	672
Institutiones Theodiæ. By Rev. J. Hontheim, S.J.	224	The Lover of Souls; or, Short Conferences on the Sacred Heart. Anon.	672
John Locke and Die Schule von Cambridge. By G. F. Von Hertling	895	Theologia Moralis per Modum Conferentiarum. Auctore P. B. Elbel, O.S.F.	672
Kirchenlexicon (Wetzer und Welte's), 89th number	223	Vade Mecum. A Prayer- and Hymn-Book for Colleges, etc.	224
Lehrbuch der Dogmatik. By Dr. T. H. Simon	224	Venerable Mother M. Caroline Friess. By Rev. P. M. Abbelin	224
Let Us Go to the Holy Table. By Rev. W. Whitty	448	Was the Apostle Peter Ever at Rome. By Rev. Mason Gallagher	882
Letters of St. Alphonsus M. de Liguori. Edited by Rev. E. Grimm, C.S.S.R. Part I., Vol. III.	672	Weizsacker's Apostolical Age of the Christian Church	894
L'Homme-Singe et les Précurseurs d'Adam. By Rev. Fr. Dierckx, S.J.	891	Wetzer und Welte's Kirchenlexicon, No. 83	672
		World's Parliament of Religions. Edited by Rev. J. H. Barrows, D.D.	670

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

VOL. XIX.—JANUARY, 1894.—No. 73.

HARNACK'S DOGMATIC HISTORY.

SECOND ARTICLE.

THE thesis of this article is, in opposition to Harnack's theory, that there is an unbroken continuity and identity of the Ante-Nicene Christianity, confessedly Catholicism, with the Christianity of the Apostles received by them, pure and unaltered, from Jesus Christ as His Gospel. No breaks, no chasms between the Gospel of Jesus Christ and the preaching of apostles and evangelists; between *their* preaching and that of their successors in the second and third centuries, between A. D. 100 and A. D. 250. No gradual and imperceptible transformation of Christianity from its genuine evangelical form and species into an ecclesiastical doctrine and religion, *i.e.*, specific Catholicism. The Church is one, the faith is one, the order is one—from the final instructions of Jesus Christ to His Apostles, A. D. 30, to the close of the life and teaching of St. John, the last Apostle, A. D. 100, and from this date to the martyrdom of St. Cyprian, A. D. 258.

Let us here repeat a part of a quotation from Harnack, contained in our first article, which furnishes a convenient starting-point for the process of tracing back the Catholic Church and faith to their origin in Jesus Christ.

"If we compare the Church in the middle of the third century (A. D. 250) with the condition of Christianity 150 to 200 years earlier (between A. D. 50 and 100), we find that there is a religious community we find the same furnished with fixed forms of every kind. . . . We find a church as a political commonwealth and institute of worship, a formulated faith, a theology

a new revealed document, the New Testament, and Christian priests."

This date is not taken as the epoch when the transformation took place and the constitution of the Church was remodelled. The Catholicism of the third century is contrasted with the Christianity of the life-time of St. John. The alteration is supposed to have taken place gradually from a beginning in the last half of the first century. The middle of the third is assumed as a period when the grand dogmatic and ecclesiastical outlines of Catholicism stand out so prominently and clearly, and the testimonies to doctrine and polity are so numerous and explicit that all plausible doubts and differences of opinion concerning the doctrinal and ecclesiastical constitution and character of Christianity are shut out.

We may fairly go back another century for a firm and indisputable position, much nearer the apostolic age, from which to carry on our polemic.

Dr. Fisher, an equally high authority with Dr. Harnack, says: "The Church stood forth, after the middle of the second century, as a distinct body. It claimed to be, in opposition to heretical and schismatical parties, the 'Catholic' Church. Membership in this one visible Church was believed to be necessary to salvation. Within the Church, and not beyond it, the Holy Spirit had his abode. The unity of the Church was secured and cemented by the episcopate—by the bishops viewed as the successors of the Apostles. The episcopate, like the apostolate, in which Peter was the centre of unity, was a unit. This idea is developed and insisted on by Cyprian, who was involved in hard contests with dissenting sects."¹

The middle of the second century is the epoch of the close of the life of St. Polycarp (d. 155), of the beginning of the career of St. Irenæus (b. 120, 140; d. 202). Tertullian, also, belongs to the latter half of this century.

A period of 120 years, from A.D. 30 to 150, includes, therefore, apostolic and post-apostolic Catholic Christianity. That it is homogeneous all through, from Peter, Paul, and John to Polycarp and Irenæus, will be proved in the sequel. Our thesis, therefore, is reduced to this: that this apostolic, Catholic Christianity had its origin from Jesus Christ.

The only and sufficient postulate on which we will base our argument is the credibility of the Four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistles of St. Paul, as historical documents from which an authentic account of the life and teachings of Jesus

¹ *History of the Christian Church*, p. 57.

Christ, of the faith of the primitive Church, and of the events which took place during the apostolic age, can be derived. All questions concerning the canon and inspiration of the New Testament can be left aside or postponed. All extant documents of the earliest ecclesiastical history can be made available to supplement and interpret the records of these books of the New Testament which have been specified above.

It is important to note distinctly at the outset that the contention is not primarily and principally concerning those elements of ancient Catholicism which have been eliminated from the Lutheran and Calvinistic Confessions. It goes much deeper into the inmost heart of Christianity, into that faith in the person of Jesus Christ which all believers in His true divinity agree in confessing as the essential centre of the Gospel. It is a contention against another Gospel, which is not another, which is a denial of the genuine Gospel, and fundamentally anti-Christian in its formal principles and its specific theory of the person and the religion of Christ. This has been fully proved in our first article. And as the endeavor of Dr. Harnack and his compeers is to undermine and destroy all historical basis of the authentic, apostolic, catholic faith in Jesus Christ, the refutation of his theory must proceed on historical lines in order to vindicate the beginning, progress, and consummation of the divine work of redemption as a fact, and as the grandest of all facts, in history. As a consequence of this vindication, all events going before and all following after the great central fact of the Incarnation are perceived in their due relation, the radii and the circumference of the great circle of human history.

The authority of the Gospels, Acts, and thirteen Epistles of St. Paul was universally acknowledged during the life-time of St. Irenæus and St. Polycarp. It has been vindicated so thoroughly and successfully by learned critics against the skeptical and destructive criticism of the German infidels, that it may be taken as a point gained and indisputable.

Apart from extrinsic evidences, the internal marks of the genuine and trustworthy character of these books are so clear and unmistakable that any line of criticism and argument to the contrary, if employed in other matters, would subvert all history, and make destructive work among the records and documents of secular literature.

The era of the beginnings of Christianity, including the history of its founder, of his Apostles, and of their successors, the contemporaries of St. Ignatius and St. Polycarp, is the most extraordinary of all human ages. The rise and progress of the Christian religion is a perfectly unique and singular event, manifesting the most

stupendous and extensive consequences following from what appear to be most inadequate causes. It cannot be explained without bringing in a supernatural power to account for the founding of a society such as the Christian Church was in the year 150; composed of a multitude bound together in the strictest unity by a common faith and discipline, and presenting a spectacle of sanctity and heroic virtues, the like of which the world has never seen. The nature and history of this society must have been known and understood by its members, and especially by its rulers and teachers. In the first period of seventy years, from the mission of the Apostles to the death of the last survivor of the sacred college, the Church was composed of the disciples of Christ, of the disciples of the Apostles, and of the disciples of their first coadjutors and successors in the ministry. In the first generation of Christians, the memory of Jesus Christ was vivid, and their devotion was enthusiastic. It was preserved and intensified by the continual recital of the acts and sayings of the Saviour, of the events attending His crucifixion, resurrection, and ascension into Heaven. The acts and teachings of the Apostles and their associates made a similar impression on their contemporaries, and their personal characters evoked an ardent sentiment of veneration and love which enhanced the veneration paid to their official character and teaching authority. The tradition of faith and history was transmitted by the first to the second generation, and so down, from the first to the second century, and from the second to the third. St. John imbibed his doctrine from Jesus Christ, St. Polycarp from St. John, St. Irenæus from St. Polycarp; Irenæus and Tertullian, his contemporary, were the masters of St. Cyprian. These are instances and examples of ten thousand similar chains of connected links, which bound the Christians of the second century to their ancestors in the first. This society of the faithful knew what it had received, and its members were ready to die for their faith. Of course, then, they would rather die than to change it knowingly and wilfully, or to suffer it to be changed. They could not be deceived in regard to it, and their rulers and teachers who were like themselves, saints and martyrs, were incapable of making the attempt to tamper with the faith, to alter the gospel, or to change anything in the apostolic ordinances received by tradition. The gospels, the other universally received Scriptures of the New Testament, and the ecclesiastical writings which are recognized in the Church, are genuine, authentic, and give testimony to the universal and original faith of the apostolic church. Especially, in regard to the true character and mission of Jesus Christ, and to the nature of that kingdom of God which He founded on the earth. There is no break between the Apostles

and their Master, or their disciples. The gospels, supplemented by the earlier chapters of the Acts, in their history and their records of the teaching of Christ and the Apostles, cover the whole ground from the birth of Christ to the end of the first century, and prove the unity and continuity of the faith, and the ecclesiastical unity of the community of the faithful. St. Matthew gives us the gospel which was preached to the Jewish Christians—St. Mark the gospel which St. Peter preached at Rome—St. Luke that which St. Paul preached to both Jews and Gentiles in many cities and countries—and St. John the gospel which he preached in Asia Minor. The universal faith of the Church during the first century which was handed down to the second, and to all succeeding ages, in respect to the Person of Jesus Christ, was the same which is contained in the evangelical history of His life, death, and resurrection. To these gospels we must look, in order to learn what and who Jesus Christ really was in His character, His work, and His Person. We learn this by learning what His own consciousness and knowledge of Himself is shown to have been, by the manifestation and affirmation which He made of His divinity in His miracles and teaching; His self-revelation in works and words. This revelation is in the gospels, which are a mirror reflecting the figure and lineaments of Jesus Christ in an image and an ideal form. It must truly represent the real and living object of our faith and worship. For it was impossible that the evangelists should imagine and invent such a character. The perfection and unparalleled excellence of this character on its human side is not only admitted, but eloquently portrayed by humanitarians and rationalists. It is involved in the essential idea of this human perfection, that the testimony of Jesus Christ to himself should be credible. He testifies to His own divinity, and therefore the truth of the Catholic dogma that He is God as well as man, is a necessary consequence from the admitted truth that He was a good man, and the best of men. Lacordaire has developed this argument in his own masterly manner in the series of Notre-Dame conferences, entitled, "Jesus Christ" Other Catholic authorities have imitated his example and both Dr. Liddon in England, and Dr. Fisher in America, have ranged themselves on the side of these champions, as valiant defenders of the central dogma of Catholic faith. Their line of reasoning is the same; from the super-eminent human sanctity of Jesus Christ to His divinity as proclaimed by Himself and confirmed by His miracles.

This is really the best, most conclusive and efficacious line of argument which can be taken, in refutation of every heresy concerning the Person of Jesus Christ, and in vindication of the Catholic faith. All other lines of argument can be made to run in the

same direction with this one, and to converge toward the common centre, the Mystery of the Incarnation, which is the very essence of Christianity.

The one simple issue in the present contention is: Who was Jesus Christ in His own inner consciousness, as made known by His self-revelation in His life and doctrine?

It is not necessary to delay, in proving what Dr. Harnack admits in respect to the Gospel, as personified in Jesus Christ; and by Him communicated to His disciples. It does not appear, therefore, to be requisite to prove how untenable is the pure, humanitarian theory, which eliminates all superhuman elements from the character of Christ. Dr. Harnack's theory appears to require and include the recognition of qualities and endowments in Him which do not, indeed, denote the existence of a nature above and distinct from the human, but which elevate His human nature and person far above the level of all other men. He is represented as a saint and Son of God in a singular and unique sense; as the chief and model of all other saints and sons of God; as the "Messiah" and "Lord" of His people; the immediate object of their faith and trust, the guide and mediator through whom they attain to sonship in God, in whom they find a sure foundation for their hope of everlasting life, on condition of repentance and holy conduct. All this supposes a special and unique vocation from God, and an extraordinary endowment of the gifts, qualities, and powers, fitting their subject for the fulfilment of His sublime calling and office. To a superficial view, it may seem that this concession of a superhuman element in the character of Christ suffices to justify and verify the ascription to Him in the Gospel of the titles "Messiah," "Lord," and "Son of God," and that it gives an adequate significance to the title "Son of Man," which he frequently assumed, as denoting, namely, that the highest ideal of humanity was realized in His person. The theory seems to avoid the point-blank contradiction of the purely humanitarian heresy to the manifest claim which Jesus Christ made to a superhuman character, and the necessary consequence that He was not even a person of superior human excellence. Herein lies its advantage, its subtlety, and its special danger for superficial and uninstructed minds. It leaves them the appearance of a Gospel, and of a Saviour whom they may regard as in a vague sense, divine, and thus delude themselves with the belief that they are "evangelical Christians." It is, however, a mere delusion. This is not the Gospel and the Christ of the four Evangelists, but a spectre, the ghost of a dead faith.

The hypothesis ignores altogether the pre-existence of Christ to his human birth, and the miraculous, supernatural mode of this birth from the Virgin. The supernatural birth is affirmed in the

Gospel, and the pre-existence of the Person who assumed humanity from the Virgin is repeatedly declared by Jesus Christ Himself.

The Arian heresy here steps in to represent the pre-existent Son of God as a second, inferior, created God, who is God in an improper sense, and in some obscure, unintelligible way made Himself man. This hypothesis pretends to satisfy the exigency of those declarations of pre-existence which are found in the Gospels. But, besides its manifold absurdities, it is contradicted by the claim which Jesus Christ made to a true and proper divinity, in which He was equal to the Father, and one with Him in essence.

Every theory which falls short of the Catholic faith is fatally shattered by the same blow which sends the pure humanitarian hypothesis to the bottom. The appearance of being out of range, by moving away from mere humanitarianism through a concession of some superhuman element in the character of Christ, is deceptive. The argument from His human sanctity to His divinity is a resistless projectile, which reaches and destroys the Arian heresy, after shattering every other which it meets on the way. Jesus Christ, as the greatest and best of men, must have known and declared the truth, and nothing but the truth, in regard to Himself. He did declare His own true and proper divinity, and this is therefore the truth. Otherwise, His declaration of His own divine personality and nature proceeded from either hallucination or a deliberate intention and effort to dupe and deceive mankind. Either one of these revolting suppositions deprives His character of all claim to our reverence.

Whatever He did teach about Himself must be true. That He claimed to be superhuman, in respect to some endowments, is easily proved by a short and simple process, and, in the present contention, is conceded. That He claimed to have a superhuman pre-existence is likewise easily proved by a somewhat longer process. That He claimed an eternal subsistence as one person in a divine Trinity, requires a longer range of argument, and admits of an indefinite amplification.

The argument can be, however, condensed and abbreviated, without being deprived of its conclusive force, and, in the present case, it must necessarily be compressed into the smallest possible compass.

To begin with the topic of pre-existence. The very title "Son of Man," so expressive of the true and perfect humanity of Jesus Christ, loses its chief significance if He is regarded as a mere man, the natural offspring of human parents. It implies that there is a peculiar and unique mode by which the person who bears it comes into the human race. There is a mystery, an incident, which

reason, left to itself, would not expect, in the appearance of such a person on the earth, clothed with the figure of a man, and living a human life. The memory of the promise that one who was the offspring of Eve should come to crush the serpent's head, is awakened. The title suggests that some one has come from beyond the bounds of nature, from heaven, from God, to redeem mankind. The gospel history, derived undoubtedly from the Blessed Virgin Mary herself, and which no skeptical criticism can discredit, informs us that the Lord was conceived and born of a virgin, by the immediate power of God. This parthenogenesis is a subject of blasphemous sarcasm on the part of some German theological professors, but there is no argument in ridicule and mere assertion. Such a miraculous birth denotes the coming of a superhuman, and, even an Arian would admit, a superangelic being, whose herald, announcing his coming into the world, was an archangel.

The Lord declared unto Nicodemus: "No man hath ascended up to Heaven, but He that came down from Heaven, the Son of Man who is in Heaven."¹

To His disciples, at the Last Supper, He said: "I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world; again, I leave the world and go to the Father." And in His prayer to the Father: "Glorify thou me, O Father, with thyself, with the glory which I had, with thee, before the world was."²

It cannot be necessary to prove that the heavenly being whose pre-existence was before all time and the world, was really and truly man. It is not likely that any will fall back on the crude, Arian hypothesis. If it is admitted that Jesus Christ pre-existed in a celestial nature, which He united to a human nature when He was conceived by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin, it is much easier to admit the possibility of a Divine Person subsisting in two distinct natures, than to suppose such a union to exist between two created natures.

Moreover, Jesus Christ was the "Son of God" before He became the Son of man, in a unique sense, by a filiation which was natural, intrinsic, and the fundamental ratio of His relation to the Father, as a distinct person. The notion that His sonship was the same thing with His human sanctity, and that His supereminent relation to God as Father, was only His superiority in sanctity to other saints of God, cannot bear a moment's comparison with the texts of the gospel. He came forth from the Father, with whom He had glory before the world was, and He returned to the Father. God was always His Father, and He was, therefore, always His Son.

On the solemn occasion at Cæsarea Philippi, Jesus asked his

¹ St. John, iii., 13.

² *Ibid.* xvi., 28; xvii., 3.

disciples, "Who say ye that I am?" Simon Peter answered and said: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God." And Jesus answered and said to him: "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona, because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father who is in Heaven."¹

Jesus Christ is not, therefore, a mere human prophet and inspired messenger of God, a saint through whom God reveals truth and works miracles. He teaches, and gives law and precept, exercises dominion over nature, raises up the sick and the dead to new life and health, lays down His own life, and re-assumes it by His resurrection, ascends into Heaven, and foretells His second coming in glory to judge the world, in his quality as the Son of the Eternal God the Father, equal to him, in the exercise of an omnipotent power, intrinsic in his nature in which he is one in essence with the Father. His divinity is implied in His whole history, from His conception to His ascension, which is miraculous all through, so that even Harnack and other extreme rationalists are obliged to confess that the elimination of the miraculous from the gospels destroys their whole texture.

The repeated affirmation of the priority of the Father to the Son, as the principle of origin whence His distinct personality is derived, in no way detracts from His essential equality. It is the Catholic Faith that in the one Godhead the Son proceeds from the Father by eternal generation, and the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son as one principle, by procession, in and through which the divine essence and substance is communicated from the fount of Deity in the Father. Moreover, as man, the Son is a creature of God, dependent and inferior, and his humanity is only a medium and instrument of divine power. There is a human mind and human will as well as a human body in the human nature of Christ, in which the Divine Person has subjected himself to divine law by becoming obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. All the mystery, the wonder, the superhuman glory and beauty of the character and life of Jesus Christ is in the genuine, authentic ideal of a divine person who has thrown about him the robe of humanity, to walk on the earth among men as their fellow and also their Sovereign, whose dominion is founded in love more than in power.

Besides all the cumulative evidences from the gospels that Jesus Christ spake and acted as the Son of God, in the sense of a proper and divine filiation, there are clear and distinct affirmations from his mouth which can bear no other interpretation. In these passages the sublime truth, which is somewhat latent and implied in

¹ St. Matt., xvi, 15-17.

His entire intellectual and moral manifestation of Himself in word and work, is explicitly set forth. Jesus Christ explicitly asserted His divinity to His friends, to the Jewish people in general, and to His declared enemies.

"Philip saith to Him : Lord, show us the Father, and it is enough for us. Jesus saith to him : So long a time have I been with you, and have ye not known me ? Philip, he who seeth me, seeth the Father also. How sayest thou, Show us the Father. Do ye not believe that I am in the Father, and the Father is in me ?"¹

To the Jews our Lord asserted His possession of an operative power equal to that of the Father and identical with it, His equal right to the homage of men, and the oneness of His essence with the essence of the Father.

One occasion was the healing of a paralytic. Jesus had gone up to Jerusalem on some great festival, regarded by good authorities as the Passover. The Jews were irritated against Him because He healed on the Sabbath. "But Jesus answered them : My Father worketh until now, and I work. Hereupon therefore, the Jews sought the more to kill him ; because he not only brake the Sabbath, but also called God his own Father, making himself equal to God. Then Jesus answered and said to them : Truly, truly, I say to you, the Son cannot do anything of himself, but what he seeth the Father do : for what things soever he doeth, these the Son also doeth in like manner. For the Father loveth the Son and showeth him all things which himself doeth : and greater works than these will he show him, that ye may wonder. For as the Father raiseth up the dead and giveth life, so the Son also giveth life to whom he willeth. And the Father judgeth no one, but hath given all judgment to the Son, that all may honor the Son, as they honor the Father."²

Another occasion was at the Feast of the Dedication.

"And Jesus walked in the temple, in Solomon's porch. The Jews, therefore, came about him, and said to him : How long dost thou keep our minds in suspense ? If thou art the Christ, tell us plainly. Jesus answered them : I speak to you and ye believe not. The works which I perform in the name of my Father, they bear testimony of me. But ye do not believe, because ye are not of my sheep ; my sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me. And I give them life everlasting, and they shall not perish ever ; and no man shall snatch them out of my hand. That which my Father hath given me is greater than all."³

This last clause is explained by St. Augustine to denote the communication of the divine essence by the eternal generation. "The

¹ St. John, xiv., 8-11.

² St. John, v., 17-23.

³ St. John, x., 23-29.

Father is God not from the Son: the Son is God from the Father: therefore the Father by the generation of the Son gave to him to be God, by generation he gave to him to be coeternal, by generation he gave to him to be equal. This is what is greater than all things."

The Lord proceeds to say: "And no one can snatch out of the hand of my Father. I and the Father are one." The force of the Greek numeral in the neuter gender *ἐν*, is lost in the English indefinite adjective "one." It is "one thing," *i.e.*, one nature, essence, substance. The reason given why no one can snatch the elect out of the hand of the Son, viz., that no one can snatch them out of the hand of the Father, implies that the Son has the same omnipotence with the Father. And this is because He is of one essence, is consubstantial with the Father.

The Jews attempted to stone Him to death "for blasphemy, and because that being a man, thou makest thyself God." Jesus did not repudiate their interpretation of His words. He vindicated His assertion from blasphemy by an illation, *a minori ad majus*. If judges could be called gods, much more could one whom the Father had specially sanctified be called "Son of God." He appealed to His divine works as the evidence that "the Father is in me, and I am in the Father." So far from understanding the plea of Jesus as equivalent to a repudiation of their charge that He made Himself God, they took it as a repetition of the same assertion: "And they sought therefore to take him, but he escaped out of their hands."

Again, when teaching in the temple, Jesus declared to the Jews that "Abraham your father rejoiced to see my day: he saw it and was glad." The meaning appears to be only that Abraham foresaw the day of the Messiah by a prophetic light. The Jews, however, suspected that He was intimating the coexistence of His day with the day of David, which would imply his eternal pre-existence. They asked Him, therefore, a question, intended to call forth a more explicit avowal of this pre-existence, viz., whether He, though He had as yet lived only a short human life, had nevertheless seen Abraham? They did, indeed, receive an explicit answer, the most remarkable and sublime of all the avowals of His divinity, made by Jesus Christ. "Truly, truly, I say to you, before Abraham was made, I AM."¹ On this passage I find no comment more worthy to be quoted than that of Dr. Liddon. "He claims pre-existence, indeed, but He does not merely claim pre-existence, He unveils a consciousness of eternal being. He speaks as One in whom time has no effect, and for whom it has no meaning. He is the I AM

¹ St. John, viii., 58.

of ancient Israel ; He knows no past, as He knows no future ; He is unbeginning, unending Being ; He is the eternal ' Now.' This is the plain sense of His language. . . . Here, again, the Jews understood our Lord, and attempted to kill Him ; while He, instead of explaining Himself in any sense which would have disarmed their anger, simply withdrew from the temple."¹

Finally, Jesus Christ declared his divinity before the Sanhedrin, and was condemned to death on account of this declaration. " And the high priest said to him : I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou art the Christ, the Son of God. Jesus saith to him : Thou hast said it. But I say to you, hereafter ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of the power of God, and coming in the clouds of heaven. Then the high priest rent his garments, saying : He hath blasphemed : what further need have ye of witnesses ? Behold now, ye have heard the blasphemy : what think ye ? They answered and said : He is worthy of death."² This accusation of blasphemy implies the sense of the title, Son of God, which is identical with true and proper divinity. A very remarkable Jewish writer of our own day, M. Salvador, who vindicates the judgment and sentence of the Sanhedrin, does so on the ground that the real point at issue was the divinity of the Saviour. The members of the Sanhedrin stated this before Pilate. " We have a law, and by our law, He ought to die, because He made Himself the Son of God." " Not," says Salvador, " because He made Himself the Son of God, in that sense of the expression which was familiar to our language and to our prophets ; but because he made Himself equal to God and truly God."³ There was no alternative, except to worship Him, or to condemn Him to death. Jesus Christ accepted the issue. He submitted to death, and staked His right to worship and His cause upon His resurrection and His second coming. He was put to death, but He has been worshiped, and in part because of and by means of His death. He did rise from the dead and ascended into heaven, and therefore, we are certain that He will come again to judge the world.

The teaching of the Apostles is equivalent to the words of Christ himself, for it is an echo of His voice. It is enough to cite one, and that the most explicit and decisive testimony of all, the testimony of St. John.

" In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. This was in the beginning with God. All things were made through Him, and without Him was made

¹ *Divinity of Jesus Christ*, pp. 187-88.

² St. Matt., xxvi., 63-66.

³ *Jesus Christ*, ii., p. 204.

nothing that was made. In Him was life, and the life was the light of men. . . . And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us (and we saw His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father), full of grace and truth."¹

This is the Gospel of Christ, of the Evangelists and Apostles, and of the Catholic Church. It is the mystery of the Incarnation, "and confessedly great is the mystery of piety, which was manifested in the flesh, was justified in spirit, was seen by angels, was preached to the Gentiles, believed in the world, ascended in glory."²

This great mystery flows forth from the wider and deeper Mystery of the Blessed Trinity, which, with the Incarnation included, is the one principal object of Catholic faith.

The distinction of personality and unity of essence in the relation of the Son to the Father needs only to be extended to the Holy Spirit, to complete the Trinity. It is not necessary to enter into an elaborate exposition of this part of the dogma. Distinction and plurality of persons in the one divine essence being granted, there is no new mystery, no new difficulty involved, in the confession of the divinity of the Holy Spirit. Faith in the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity has always been accompanied by faith in the Third Person. The Macedonian heresy was only a sequel of Arianism. The dogma of the divinity of Jesus Christ has always been indissolubly joined to the dogma of the Trinity. It is enough to call to mind that the formation of the sacred humanity of Jesus Christ, and its sanctification, are referred to the Holy Spirit as the author of this masterpiece of divine wisdom and power, and that he is united under one name with the Father and the Son in the baptismal formula, to vindicate his claim to a distinct and equal personality in the Godhead, and his right to be worshiped, and glorified together with the Father and the Son.

The Catholic thesis as against Harnack and his compeers is in fact substantially proved, by showing that Jesus Christ declared His own divinity, revealed the mystery of the Incarnation, and sealed His testimony with His blood. This is made known to us by the witness of His disciples, especially of St. John, the last survivor of the Apostles. St. John at the close of the first century, proclaims this same sublime truth; which Jesus Christ proposed to His disciples, to the Jewish people, and to their rulers, demanding their faith under the penalty of eternal condemnation; as the faith of the apostolic church. The Gospel of Jesus Christ and the Gospel of the Apostles is therefore one and the same. It would be easy, although it would surely be superfluous to corroborate

¹ St. John I., 1-14, 14.

² St. Paul, Ep. Tim., iii., 16.

this statement by the Epistles of St. Paul. A few years before his martyrdom he wrote from his prison to the Ephesians: "To me, the least of all saints, is this grace given, to preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ, and to enlighten all, what is the dispensation of the mystery hidden during ages in God—according to the eternal purpose which he formed in Christ Jesus our Lord."¹ It is impossible to any one reading the Acts and Epistles to doubt, that the gospel which St. Paul preached, was indetical with the gospel of St. John. All the extant records of the preaching of St. Peter and the other Apostles prove the unanimous consent of the entire apostolic college.

All the rubbish of hypothesis and pseudo-criticism heaped about the beginnings of apostolic and Catholic Christianity are swept away as soon as Jesus Christ is recognized as the Incarnate Son of God. All these conjectures take their rise from the humanitarian theory. That Jesus Christ, being God from eternity, became man, lived, died, rose again, and ascended into heaven, promising to come again in glory to judge the world—is evidence that the work he accomplished on the earth was equal in grandeur to His divine character. He was the creator of mankind, the author of all the religious institutions of the patriarchs, of Abraham and of Moses, which were only preparations and preambles of His gospel and His church. Being the author and the lord of life, His death could only have been a voluntary and temporary laying down of His corporeal life for the redemption of the world. As the Messiah of the Jews and the Gentiles, the world-religion and universal church founded by Him must correspond to His foregoing operation in human history, as the principal building to its portico. There is nothing which exhibits this correspondence in solidity, extent and perpetuity except Historical Christianity, *i.e.*, Catholicism, in its doctrine, its law, its worship and its hierarchical organization. The religion, the inchoate Catholic Church, which preceded, embodied in Judaism, endured for at least thirteen centuries from Moses, and has even survived from the destruction of the temple to the present time. If the Christianity of Christ and the Apostles, the genuine and pure Gospel, was so frail and slightly built that it could not last longer than from half a century to a century and a half from the close of the apostolic age, Jesus Christ did nothing worthy of the character which He claimed, of the predictions which He uttered, and His work was a failure. It is necessary, therefore, to the vindication of His divinity, to proclaim the continuity and unity of the Catholic Church of the persecution of Diocletian, of the triumph of Constantine, and of the

² iii., 8-11.

Nicene Council; from Cyprian, Irenæus, Polycarp, Ignatius, the Apostles, and from Jesus Christ as its Founder.

The demand which Jesus Christ made with His own mouth on the homage of mankind as its King having been demonstrated, it remains only to show what were the principles of His kingdom as He proclaimed and announced it; to show that these principles are identical with those of Catholicism.

According to Dr. Harnack, the specific difference which determines the essential nature of Catholicism consists in the doctrine of the sacraments, of penance, of faith, and of authority in faith. All else is only a consequence. But if the faith proposed by infallible authority, in the Catholic sense, be taken alone as the essence of Catholicism, the doctrine of the sacraments and of penance follows as a consequence, just as much as the papacy and everything else defined by Catholic authority.

Now, Jesus Christ, as the Son of God, possessed infallible authority, and by it proposed all that He taught as revealed truth to the firm, undoubting assent of faith. At Cæsarea Philippi, when He demanded a confession of faith in Himself, and, on the confession made by Peter in the name of the rest, promised to build His church upon a rock which should defy all the assaults of hell, He evidently made of faith confessed on the authority of divine revelation the architectonic and consolidating foundation of His church.

The Catholic interpretation of this promise of the Lord to St. Peter, that Peter, namely, as prince of the apostles, in his perpetual office of vicerent of Christ, living in his successors, enthroned in the supreme See of Rome, which he founded, should become the chief and fundamental base and principle of stability in the church; by no means excludes, rather it perfectly harmonizes with other references to Christ Himself, to faith, to the confession of the faith, to the office of the other apostles, and to the indefectible stability in faith of the universal society of Christian believers. Christ Himself is the primary source of all the stability imparted to the Church; He is its builder and its foundation. It is the faith of Peter and his confession of faith which makes him fit to receive the name and the quality of a rock. His confession is made in the name of all the apostles, of their successors as well as in his own name, in the name of the whole Church to the end of time. The Petrine character and stability are given to all the foundation stones, and to the entire structure erected upon them, the universal Church. The principle of stability is centred in Peter and his See, as the perpetual and supreme ruling power in the Church, by which it is preserved in unity and made impregnable against all assaults to the end of time.

The unity and stability of the Church, built by Jesus Christ upon

an impregnable rock, are in their innermost and principal character unity and stability in faith and the confession of faith.

The Christian faith is founded on a divine revelation, which in its final and complete perfection was made through Jesus Christ. Infallibility was necessarily and intrinsically inherent in Him as the author of the revelation, on whose word it rests. But it was also necessary that that this infallibility should be communicated as a gift to St. Peter and the apostles. They were instructed by Jesus Christ Himself personally, not only as believers, but as teachers. The world in general does not receive directly and immediately from Jesus Christ His infallible doctrine. It is received immediately through the apostles, and it was only through them that it was proclaimed to the world. The Lord handed over His kingdom to the apostles; through their ministry idolatry was to be expelled from the Roman empire, the empire itself to be subjugated, false philosophy to be vanquished, the world to be regenerated, the universal church and the world-religion to be established. As supreme authority and infallibility were necessary attributes of the office of Messiah and Redeemer, and as Jesus Christ Himself did not remain on the earth to exercise this office in person, it was requisite that he should bring His supreme and infallible authority into contact with the world through an adequate medium. Accordingly, He gave to St. Peter and the apostles a share in His own divine mission, and commissioned them to continue and extend it through all nations to the ends of the earth, and through all ages to the end of time.

All Christians who believe in supernatural religion, in the true divinity of Jesus Christ, in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the inspired word of God, are bound to acknowledge the infallible authority of the Apostles, and they do acknowledge the same. It is through this authority that we receive the divine revelation, the Scriptures, the faith, and the knowledge of the way of salvation. Now, since Jesus Christ commissioned the Apostles to disciple and baptize all nations, and to teach them the observance of all His precepts, it is evident that their commission was not purely personal and transient. As the founder of a universal and perpetual religion, He was bound to provide for its stability and diffusion as His kingdom on the earth. As He committed it in charge to the apostolate, promising His own perpetual presence and supreme direction to His Church, He must have given an apostolic commission adequate to its purposes and commensurate to the extent and duration of the apostolic mission.

The teaching of the Apostles was the proximate and universal rule of faith. All who admit this must hold to what Harnack de-

finer to be the specific difference of Catholicism, the principle of faith and authority in faith. The faith is that which the Apostles taught as received from Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit; the authority is His divine authority delegated to them as His ambassadors. This authority must have been made permanent and perpetual.

Protestants profess to believe that it was made permanent and perpetual by a written record, a collection of scriptures, of which they were the authors or the sponsors. The authority of the Apostles perseveres, and proposes the exclusive and sufficient rule of faith to the Church in all ages through the canonical books of the Bible, especially of the New Testament, which they have bequeathed, as the last will and testament of the Saviour, to all future generations of mankind.

Now, it is obvious that, on the hypothesis that Jesus Christ took this way of building His Church, His work was a signal failure. He built it, not on a rock, but on sand, and out of perishable materials. The edifice constructed by the Apostles, like the transient commission they are supposed to have received, was ephemeral. They all neglected, and in particular St. John—who survived to give the finishing touches to their work, and might be supposed to be specially responsible for instructing Polycarp, Ignatius, Clement, and other chief pastors in the first principles of Christianity—St. John, I say, neglected to inform the Christians of the post-apostolic age precisely how many and which writings constituted the canon of the New Testament.

Those who imagine an apostolic and primitive church after the Protestant ideal are obliged to confess that it disappeared in the second century. By the year 150 another church had succeeded to its place, which by the year 250 stands forth in such colossal proportions that no one who has any historic sense and knowledge can fail to perceive that the universal Christianity of that epoch is Catholicism. This is the Christianity which conquers under Constantine; which in the great councils vanquishes the heresies which arise as great monsters out of the abyss to contend with it; which broods over the waters of the incoming flood of barbarism and evokes a new world, the world of Christian civilization.

Now, if the Apostles were not the authors and founders under Christ of this historical Christianity, then it is a human invention which sprang up after the year 100, grew imperceptibly and rapidly until the year 325, developed and extended with gigantic strides during the next twelve centuries, has withstood the new assaults of the last 300 years, and assuredly is not at the present moment ready for the historian of its decline and fall.

Now, there is an exact parallel between the theory of those who

deny the divine character of Jesus Christ and that of those who deny the divine origin and authority of the Catholic Church. The former theory is humanitarian. It represents Jesus Christ as a great and good man, around whose shoulders the inventive genius of the Christians of the second century threw a mantle of divinity. The second theory represents the Catholic Church as a human commonwealth which was transformed into a divine institution by the inventive genius of those who are considered to have been the creators of the new Christianity of Catholicism. Anti-Christians began by blaspheming Christ, but have changed their original blasphemy into a laudation of his human character. So, likewise, anti-Catholics began by denouncing the Catholic Church as something infernal, but now the best and ablest among them emphatically praise and glorify it as a grand and useful, even a morally necessary human institution. But the same argument which destroys the position of the former class is equally destructive of the position of the latter class. If Jesus Christ were a mere man, he could not have been either great or good, because he claimed to be God. If the Catholic Church were a human institution, it could not be intellectually and morally admirable, because it claimed divine origin and authority. The papacy, the episcopal hierarchy, the priesthood, the sacraments as efficacious means of sanctification, the infallible authority of the teaching Church, the entire ecclesiastical doctrine and order rejected by Protestants, were either of divine origin or gross and baneful impostures. The great prelates, the great doctors, the canonized martyrs and confessors of ancient Christianity, on the supposition that Catholicism was a colossal fraud, were either dupes and victims of a superstitious hallucination or the fraudulent authors of a fabulous system by which the Christian people were duped and deceived.

This latter supposition is too gross to find favor at the present time with believers in Christ and Christianity, or even with enlightened rationalists. It must be admitted that the great fathers and rulers of the Catholic Church were both sincere and intelligent. They believed that they were walking in the footsteps of Christ and the Apostles. They could not be deceived or deceivers. It was impossible that they should drift away unconsciously from the pure Christianity of the Apostles, or that they should deliberately combine together to alter it. It is an injury to Jesus Christ to suppose that He did not give to His religion and His Church a stable and permanent foundation, and fully instruct His Apostles by word of mouth and by the Holy Spirit how to carry out His intentions. They understood their commission perfectly, and must have carefully adopted efficacious means of instructing their associates and successors in the ministry how to continue the work which they

had commenced. The universal horror excited by early heresies, and the commotion excited in the Church by controversies concerning the observance of Easter and the baptism of heretics, prove how deeply imbued were the minds of all Catholic Christians with the spirit of loyalty to the doctrines and ordinances of the Apostles; and how impossible it was that innovations should be introduced and become universal, either imperceptibly or by an open exercise of authority.

The Christianity of the sub-apostolic and post-apostolic age must be identical with that of the apostolic age.

It is conceded by all Christians that the infallible authority of the Apostles was the permanent and perpetual rule of faith, and that their constitution of the Church was of perpetual obligation.

In what manner the apostolic authority was to be perpetuated, we must learn historically by their own declarations and acts, supplemented by the practical and doctrinal interpretation of their successors. The discussion of apostolic declarations and acts, as recorded in the Scriptures of the New Testament, has been so frequently and exhaustively carried on by Catholic writers in recent times, that it may be here omitted. The writer of the present article has contributed his share to the discussion in this REVIEW (No. for April, 1892), and that former article may be referred to as filling the gap in the argument now in hand.

One thing is certain, *prima facie*, that the Apostles did not present to their disciples a book embodying a formal code of doctrine and legislation as their rule of faith and conduct. The rule of faith during the first century was in their living and teaching authority, to which the written documents, afterwards included in the canon of the New Testament, were subsidiary in so far as they were known and possessed by the faithful.

Neither did they formally bequeath such a book to the succeeding generation as a sole and sufficient rule of faith.

Had they done so, it would have been known, proclaimed, and universally accepted.

On the contrary, the second century recognized the Catholic Episcopate, under the primacy of the Bishop of Rome, as the continuation of the apostolate under the principality of St. Peter.

St. Irenæus is a competent and sufficient witness to this fact.

He was the disciple of St. Polycarp, who was the disciple of St. John. He resided for a time at Rome, visited the other principal Christian churches, became the Bishop of Lyons, and suffered martyrdom, A. D. 202. He represents Asia Minor and the West, as well as the East and Gaul; and his testimony stretches backward not only to the middle of the second century, but, through the chain connecting it with St. Polycarp and St. John, back to the beginning of the century and to the end of the first.

St. Irenæus writes as follows :

"Therefore, the tradition of the Apostles, manifested in the whole world, can be seen in every church by all who wish to discover what the true doctrines are ; and we can enumerate those who are instituted bishops in the churches by the Apostles, and their successors even to our own times, who have never known or taught anything like the madness which is vented by these persons (*i.e.*, Gnostic heretics). And certainly, if the Apostles had known recondite mysteries which they taught the perfect, separately and concealed from the rest of their disciples, they would with most special care have taught them to those men to whom they committed the churches ; for they desired that these should be very perfect and irreprehensible in all things whom they left after them as their own successors, *delivering over to them their own place of magistracy*—from whose exemplary conduct great advantages would ensue ; whereas their lapse from rectitude would be the cause of the utmost calamity. But since it would take too long to enumerate in a book like the present one, the succession of all the churches, by merely exhibiting the tradition of the greatest and most ancient Church, which is known to all, founded and constituted by the two most glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul, at Rome, the tradition of faith received from the Apostles and proclaimed to all men, and which has come down even to us by the successions of the bishops—we bring to confusion all those who assemble in unauthorized meetings at their own pleasure for the sake of vainglory, or because they are blinded and misled by false opinions. For with this Church, on account of her more powerful principality, it is necessary that every church, *i. e.*, the faithful everywhere dispersed, should agree, in which church has always been preserved, by the faithful dispersed, that tradition which is from the Apostles. The blessed Apostles, having founded and instructed the Church, handed down the episcopate of the administration of the Church to Linus : and now Eleutherius holds the episcopate in the twelfth place from the Apostles. By this same order, and by this same succession, both that tradition which is in the Church from the Apostles, and the preaching of the truth have come down to us. And this is a most full demonstration that it is one and the same life-giving faith which is preserved in the Church from the Apostles and handed down in truth."¹

"The heavenly gift has been confided to the Church, as a principle of life to all her members. In her is accomplished all that operation of the Holy Spirit in which they have no part ; who, instead of being in communion with the Church, exclude themselves from life by their bad doctrines and criminal conduct. For,

¹ *Against Heresies*, iii., sec. 3.

where the Church is, there is the Spirit of God; and, where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church, and with her all grace."¹

A Protestant divine, Zeigler, remarks:

"To the mind of Irenæus, it is the episcopate which sanctions the rule of faith, not *vice versa*. With him, as with Cyprian, the highest ecclesiastical office is inseparable from orthodox doctrines. He makes the preservation of tradition, and the presence of the Holy Ghost with the Church dependent upon the bishops, who, in legitimate succession, represent the apostles; and this, manifestly, because he wants at any price to have a guarantee for the unity of the visible Church. This striving after unity appears, in the most striking way, in the passage where he passes, as if in a prophetic spirit, beyond himself, and anticipates the Papal Church of the future."²

No! he does not anticipate; he describes a present reality, and it is an evasive shift to call his plain statement prophetic.

This part of the subject has been more fully treated in an article on "The Hierarchy in the First Two Centuries," in this REVIEW (July, 1892), to which I refer the reader who desires more ample satisfaction.

The bishops of the closing first and opening second centuries, of whom St. Irenæus is the spokesman, understood fully what office the apostles had committed to them. Specimens of this numerous episcopate are Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp; and Irenæus is their faithful interpreter. It is impossible to overthrow the historical demonstration which is based on the testimony of Irenæus, supported by that of Ignatius and Tertullian, that St. Peter and the apostles transmitted the apostolate, with supreme teaching and ruling authority, to bishops as their successors.

It is evident, therefore, that the Catholic episcopate inherited the promises and gifts which Jesus Christ gave to the original Apostles, except in so far as these were, in their nature and scope, transient, and were fulfilled, once for all, in laying the foundations of the Church, a task which could not be done over again.

These promises and gifts were not given to the Apostles as individuals, to be completely exhausted in their lifetime. They were given to them as the beginners of a hierarchy, which was to last to the end of the world. The promises to St. Peter were made to the supreme pontificate which he was to establish in Rome, and transmit to his successors. The endowments of the apostolate were perennial. The mission of the apostles was a mission to make disciples, to teach and to govern through all nations and ages to the end of time. The Holy Spirit was promised first, and afterwards given, to be the spirit and soul of the Church, especially of

¹ *Ibid.*, Sec. 24.

² *Irenæus*, Bischof von Lyon, Berlin, 1871

its hierarchy, to lead the authorized teachers, and the taught, into all truth, and to be a perennial source and fountain of grace. The infallibility of the Catholic Church is, therefore, implied, and virtually contained in the infallibility of the Apostles. From the Church we receive the canon of the New Testament and the assurance of its inspiration. We began with assuming the authenticity and credibility of certain parts of it as historical testimony. From this testimony, we have established the facts of the mission and divinity of Christ, the mission and supreme authority of the apostles, the divine origin and constitution of the Church. And from the infallible testimony of the Church we receive the very word of Christ, the Son of God, given personally and by the revelation and inspiration of the Holy Spirit, through the medium of apostolic scriptures and apostolic tradition. Thus the ultimate ground and motive of our faith is the veracity of God. Divine faith must rest on divine revelation; and since the revelation is not made to men in general, directly and individually, it must be proposed through a sufficient authority.

A sufficient and adequate authority must be one which God renders infallible. A lesser authority deserves and can justly exact only a human faith, the criterion of which lies in the individual reason. Withdraw from underneath the fabric of the Church its infallibility, and we are on the high road to become humanitarians and pure rationalists, *i.e.*, in ceasing to be Catholics we must cease to be Christians. Following this road will not bring us to solid and high ground, from which we can gain a clear and wide prospect, but into a swamp. Abandoning Christianity and Christ, we do not remove them from their place in history, but merely go away out of their sight and lose ourselves. They remain in the world, and they are inseparable. Christianity is the Catholic Church, which is the kingdom of Christ. Being a king, he must found a kingdom, commensurate with His own divine greatness. There is no such kingdom except the Catholic Church, and to deny that He is its founder is to deny that He did anything worthy of His divinity in the world. To break the continuity between Christ, the Apostles, historical Christianity, and the Catholic Church, is to falsify his promises and predictions, to rob him of his glory and divest him of his divinity. From belief in the divine Christ follows, logically and historically, belief in the apostolic and divine origin of Catholicism. Deny it, and the whole work of the Apostles is like a picture over which a wet sponge has been passed. It has no consistency and no intelligible meaning or distinct traits. Moreover, the character and life of Christ are reduced to an isolated chapter in history; they become an enigma which has received and can receive no rational solution. From Christ to the Catholic Church there is an *a priori* demonstration, concluding the

nature of the effect from the nature of the cause. On the other hand, the Catholic Church is a most brilliant and convincing proof of the divinity of Christ by the demonstration *a posteriori* from the nature of the effect, to the nature of the cause.

The development of the Catholic Church during the first three centuries, the victory which it gained over Judaism, heathenism and heresy, its triumph under the banner of the Labarum, is a manifestation of the divine power of Jesus Christ. Likewise, the history of the Catholic Church from Constantine to Charlemagne, a second chapter almost equally momentous, is a signal demonstration that Christ was working in it with divine omnipotence. From that time to this, a period of eleven centuries, chapter has succeeded to chapter in this marvellous history, each one furnishing new evidence of the divine power of Jesus Christ and of the fulfillment of his prophetic words. The kingdom bears witness to the king, and the end is not yet.

There is nothing to obscure the testimony except the record which ecclesiastical history furnishes of the sins and delinquencies of men. The visible Church is not a society composed exclusively of the saints and the elect. Although divine, it is also very human. In many respects the kingdom of Christ presents an outward aspect similar to that of other empires in the world. Therefore many are scandalized. Yet, in reality, all the evidence furnished by the true history of the Church—that it would long ago have been dashed in pieces amid the storms of human passion, if it had been a purely human institution—must be added to the positive evidence that it is divine. It is a dark background which brings into clearer and brighter relief the presence and the power of God.

We have seen on one of our lakes a water-spout cross from one shore to the other, over the surface of a great wall of black cloud, like a beautiful white column of vapor. Like this is the passage of the pure and brilliant figure of Jesus Christ across human history. Not only across post-Christian, but also across pre-Christian history. For in His pre-existent state the Son of God was the light of the world, the Redeemer of mankind, the author of all the good which can be seen in human history from the creation of man to the incarnation. His kingdom began in Eden; it embraces all ages and all nations, although first perfectly and finally organized when He founded the Catholic Church. The testimony which His kingdom gives to His royal character and power is, therefore, not complete unless He is represented as the Alpha and Omega, the beginning as well as the end of all divine revelation.

Moreover, it is really ignorance or misrepresentation of Christian history which is the source of the impeachment of the Catholic Church, sustained by the citation of the records of this history. The dark pages of each chapter only are read and commented

upon by the irreconcilable enemies of the Church; they are exaggerated and interpolated with falsehoods. Hence there is a widespread and popular historical romance which has usurped the place of true and authentic history.

The bright pages of history must be read, and each chapter be regarded as a whole, in connection with all the other chapters. From this high point of view; as from the Eiffel tower, Paris and the surrounding landscape is a vision of grandeur and beauty, all unsightly, mean and loathsome objects dwindled and lost to view in the general features of the magnificent prospect; Christianity and the Catholic Church are visible in their just perspective and proportions. As the world bears testimony to its Creator, so does the Catholic Church bear testimony to its divine author, Jesus Christ.

Lacordaire, in his own elevated plane of thought and eloquent language, has given, within the compass of a few sentences, an outline sketch of this prospect of the City of God and its surrounding domain of Historical Christianity.

"Christianity is the greatest phenomenon which has been naturalized in the world, the greatest intellectual phenomenon, the greatest moral phenomenon, the greatest social phenomenon—something unique, in a word, and, yet once more, something divine.

"But what is the primary cause of this phenomenon? Every phenomenon has a cause. Who, then, has made the Catholic Church? Who has founded that society which rules minds by certainty, regulates souls by the highest virtues, blesses the human race by the new elements it has given to civilization? Who has formed under a hierarchy spiritual and unarmed that body wherein conviction, holiness, unity, universality, stability and life form a tissue of superhuman and incontestable beauty? Who has designed and produced it? Is it time or chance? Is it the work of many, or of one alone? It is but one—yes, one alone—Jesus Christ. He is the artist! It is He who founded that Church whose ineffable architecture we have contemplated together."¹

Here I close my contention, that the divine Christ, His Gospel, the inspired canonical books of the New Testament, apostolical Christianity, the Catholic hierarchy, Catholicism pure, simple and entire, are indissolubly bound together as one inseparable whole. Dr. Harnack, by making this thesis historically certain, has rendered a greater service to the Catholic cause than any harm likely to result from his rationalistic hypothesis. It is a great advantage to have the true issue made clear. On the one side it is Catholicism; on the other, some form of rationalism more or less tinctured with Christian elements.

AUGUSTINE F. HEWIT.

¹ *Jesus Christ*, Conf. 1, p. 10.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGES: THEIR ORIGIN AND THEIR METHODS.

(CONCLUDED.)

VI.

1. Let us go behind this college life and note the guide books by which the masters were directed in their teachings. We are accustomed to consider pedagogy a modern science. But let us not be deceived. In those mediæval days there were wholesome studies of methods. Then as now, masters considered the ways and means by which best results might be reached. The manual of the thirteenth century most in vogue was a small work in seven chapters, known as "*De Disciplina Scholarium*,"¹ and attributed to Boëthius, but not written till the University of Paris had been fully established. The book is quoted by Roger Bacon in 1267.² The name of Boëthius rendered it popular and gave it a prescriptive standing that it might have never otherwise attained. Still there is a goodly share of sound advice running through its pages. The unknown author would have instruction continuous, uninterrupted, riveted in the brain by frequent repetition until the verses of the poets and the sentences of the philosophers find a fixed place in the memory. The master should not be content with the teaching of mere words, which makes sophists, nor with purely mental activity which develops the judgment and originates science, but he should also with both of these combine common usage that comes with habit. Science without practice is of small avail, whereas practice without science availeth greatly. The scholar should always be subject to the master, for only he who knows how to obey knows how to govern himself. This submission has a threefold character; attention in practice, docility of mind, and good will of the soul; the student should ever be attentive to listen, docile to understand, and ready to retain. It behooves the master to understand his scholars and direct each according to his talents: the obtuse mind to mechanics, the mediocre to politics, the acute to philosophy.³ Further on, we are given the various qualifications of the master: He should be erudite, affable, strict, grave and reserved without being arrogant; he should be honest, truthful, just, prudent, faithful, constant, patient, and know well himself what he teaches others.⁴ Masters and

¹ *Patrologia Latina*, vol. lxiv.

² In the *Opus Magus*.

³ *Caput* v., col. 1233.

⁴ *Cap.* vi., col. 1235. All these qualities are explained.

scholars should constitute one family, and if the master is obliged to administer corporal punishment it must be with permission of the parent. In all that has been here transcribed very little can be improved upon after an experience of six centuries.

The Carmelite, William Whetely, made a careful study of this little volume, and according to its principles during five and twenty years directed the schools of Stamford, and under his efficient management Stamford grew to such prominence that it was considered a rival of Oxford and Cambridge. The historian of Stamford says of the Carmelite convent: "Certain it is this convent was as happy in the famous men it produced, as their schools and house itself were remarkable for the strictness of their discipline."¹ Whetely wrote an elaborate commentary upon the manual attributed to Boëthius, whence Leland calls him "Boëtianus." The commentary is still extant in manuscript in Pembroke College Library; Cambridge.²

2. A voice out of the same age, speaking to us from Brescia—the voice of a judge learned in the law. Albertan Albertani (circ. 1250) among some moral prosings discusses the subject of education with the practical sense of a man of affairs. In a tract titled *Of Speaking and of Silence—De Loquendi et Tacendi Modo*—the author lays down the requisites for study (cap. xi.). According to him there are three essentials that enter into the acquisition of knowledge; namely, doctrine, use and exercise, and practical application. The mind is afterwards aided by forcible thoughts on doctrine, which should be committed to memory; by constant reading; by writing, and by chewing and masticating the science that one learns. While studying one should overlook or despise no science, no written document; one should never feel ashamed to learn from any person who can give information, and finally one should not despise others because one has become familiar with some science.³

3. Another manual of pedagogy is the treatise *De Eruditione Principum*, from the pen of William Pèrault, who was contemporary with Thomas Aquinas. He died about 1275. For a long time his book was attributed to St. Thomas, and is still to be found in all the printed editions of his works.⁴ Echard proved conclusively that the treatise belongs to Peraldus or Pèrault.⁵ The work is divi-

¹ Peck, *Academia Tertia Anglicana*, lib. viii, p. 44.

² See J. Bass Mullinger, *University of Cambridge*, pp. 637, 638.

³ See an analysis of this little work by Vincenzo di Giovanni in *Nota* published at Palermo, 1874. A copy of the work itself is to be found in the Mazarin Library. See also Everardo Micheli, *Storia della Pedagogia Italiana*, pp. 79, 80.

⁴ *Opusculum*, XXXVII, vol. xvi., Parma edition, 1865.

⁵ *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum*, i., pp. 131–136. Paris. 1719.

ded into seven books. The first is made up of moral reflections considered suitable to a young prince. It dwells upon the vanity of worldly riches, praise and glory, and the risks, miseries and responsibilities that accompany earthly power, and inculcates clemency, piety, wisdom and the other qualities becoming princely power and true nobility.¹ The second treats of the relations of the prince towards God and the Church. It dwells upon the faith, hope, charity and the fear of the Lord that should possess him. It lays stress on the rules and motives urging one to the love of God and of one's neighbor.² The third unfolds the care the prince should take of himself. While engaged and occupied with others it behooves him not to neglect his own interior life. He may possess all knowledge of men and things, but not knowing himself he would only be building upon a ruinous foundation. He is not wise whose wisdom does not extend to the attaining of his own salvation. In his every act he should inquire, "Is it lawful? is it expedient? is it proper?" He should frequently enter into himself and ask himself who he is, what he is, and what manner of life he leads. He proves himself stronger in overcoming himself than in conquering an army.³ The fourth book treats of a prince's relations with others. It shows the misfortunes and temptations to which princes are exposed when surrounded by designing and corrupt men; it lays stress upon the necessity of wise counsellors, and having honest men at the head of affairs, of being above the acceptance of rewards, of doing justice by the poor and never coveting whatever may be theirs.⁴

The fifth book is the most important. It is composed of sixty-six chapters, and may be regarded as a complete treatise upon education. Peraldus lays down the elementary principle that parents owe it to their offspring as a primary duty, the lacking in which were inexcusable, to see that they are educated. This discipline is not merely one of words; it must also be a training by means of the whip. *Nec sufficit contra ista eruditio verborum, immo necessaria est etiam disciplina verberum.*⁵ The child is taken from his tender years and his dispositions are studied and his habits are formed accordingly. The advantages of bearing the yoke of the Lord from the days of youth are clearly laid down. Five things are required on the part of the master; namely, that he be endowed with fair talent, that his life be upright and honorable, that he be possessed of knowledge accurately acquired and well digested before instructing others, that he be possessed of an eloquent manner of imparting information, and that he have experience as a

¹ *S. Thomæ Opera*, vol. xvi., p. 391-403.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 400-414.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 422-427.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 414-422.

⁵ *Lib. v.*, cap. i., p. 427.

teacher. The instruction imparted by an experienced teacher has five qualities: it is plain and simple so as to reach the feeblest intelligence; it is imparted in the fewest possible words; it is useful; it is presented in such a variety of lights as to render it agreeable; and the subject-matter is neither too long drawn out nor too rapidly passed over. This is a valuable pedagogical chapter¹ upon the form and method of teaching. No less instructive is the succeeding chapter upon the qualifications of a good student.

The good student should be of good life. Pride, anger, envy, sloth, gluttony, love and hatred are all impediments in the way of learning. The good student endeavors to overcome every deadly vice. He prays much; for wisdom being a gift of God, he constantly beseeches the Divine Source for an abundance thereof. He brings humility to his studies, especially to all studies concerning Holy Writ. This humility leads him to that honest love of truth, possessing which he is not ashamed to confess ignorance when he does not know, and is ever ready and willing to learn. As he who receives from everybody becomes all the richer, so he who learns from everybody becomes all the wiser. The good student ever cherishes the fear of God in his heart. This fear, which is the beginning of wisdom, leads him to walk carefully in the right way, and guards him against error, presumption and negligence in study. He is meek, ever receiving instructions, especially the lessons of the sacred Scriptures with docility. He is diligent in his studies; for he who hastily passes over the words of a text, does not perceive all its meaning or appreciate all its beauty. Here the student is cautioned against that curiosity which would sacrifice the important for the trivial; against fickleness and instability in reading; against quarrelsome disputations and verbal hairsplittings.

The good student is methodical; where there is an absence of method, there may indeed be hard work, but there is very little progress. He is persevering in his studies; this is the essential condition of all advancement. Perseverance has been called the mother of the arts, negligence the step-mother of all learning. Another requisite, very essential for youths, is continued practice. The unused iron rusts. Hence the value of disputations amicably conducted; they polish and sharpen intellects. Furthermore, the good student impresses upon his memory whatever he reads; otherwise his labor would be in vain. What avails it that the dog catches the game, if forthwith he lets it go? Water easily receives impressions, but to no purpose, since it does not retain them. The

¹ Cap. ix., pp. 431-432.

mind discovers wisdom, the memory preserves it. Intellectual slowness may be aided by assiduity, and defective memory improved by frequent repetitions and taking notes. The scholar should ever regard his teacher with esteem and respect and be towards him submissive and affectionate. Finally, he should be careful to thank and glorify God for the talents and the knowledge with which he has been favored.¹

The remainder of the book is devoted to the discipline of youth as regards behavior, clothing, food and drink, marriage and virginity. The author dwells upon the temptations to which young men are exposed; the puerilities that they should avoid; the virtues that they should practice, especially patience, humility and obedience. He commends matrimony and speaks in glowing terms of the love and esteem that should mutually exist between husband and wife. But he pleads most earnestly for freedom of action among those young men who would lead a life of celibacy and serve God in a religious order. Several chapters are devoted to the education of daughters. They should not be allowed to gad about, should never be idle, and should devote themselves to study. They should be brought up chaste, humble, pious, meek and reserved, and their virtue carefully guarded. They should prize goodness and moral worth above physical beauty and consider the spiritual adornments of the soul superior to those that set forth the beauty of the body. The honor of widowhood is commented upon; the state of virginity is lauded and shown to be far above that of matrimony; its beauty is compared to the lily and its efficacy and special glory are extolled.²

Of the remaining books little need be said. The sixth is devoted to the relations of the prince to his subjects. The author begins by picturing the magnitude of the evil an impious prince can inflict upon his subjects, and the punishment he is liable to incur. Afterwards the blessings that accompany the reign of a good prince are eloquently depicted. The seventh and last book is devoted to the relations of the prince to his enemies, and to the various duties belonging to a military life. The only recognized avenues to honor and position in those days were the military and the clerical life. So it is here stated that "as in the body of the Church the clergy constitute the brain, so the military organization is the hand . . . from the clergy it has direction and accordingly owes the clergy protection."³ Here ends this remarkable treatise on education from the pen of William Pérault. Petit-Radel, after giving a very inadequate account of the book, says with truth: "We can praise the lucid style, the wise maxims, the

¹ *Ibid.*, Cap, x., pp. 433-434.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 427-466.

³ Cap., iii., p. 472.

noble and beautiful sentiments, the good order in details, that pervade the work."¹ The recognition of Pérault as a great educator and an eminent writer is a tardy act of justice.

4. Another Dominican who preserved the educational traditions of the Dominicans in his writings, and still more with his pupils in the school-room, was Fra Bartolommeo da San Concordio (1262-1347), of whom the Pisan chronicle speaks in terms of admiration as a teacher. The highest tribute the chronicle pays him is this: that while he stimulated genius he did not neglect youths of mediocre talent; that he was accessible to all; that he communicated what he had learned without distinction and without pretension; and so well did he succeed that the most unpolished minds went forth from his school so carefully instructed that their skill seemed to be natural and their efficiency to come from art. Besides conducting the studium of his convent, he established a school of oratory and poetry for the laity. In his *Ammaestramenti degli Antichi*, he gathered together about two thousand passages from one hundred and twenty different authors, and through the quotations he has interspersed his own beautiful and practical suggestions. There is little that is new in his method, but when treating of the natural dispositions of soul and body, of the actions that lead the way to virtue, of study and teaching, and of the mode of speaking, he says things that every student of pedagogy might read with profit.²

5. A volume breathing the spirit of St. Thomas, and written in the same key-note with that of Pérault is the "*De Regimine Principum*" of Egidius Romano of the Colonna family (1241-1316). Egidius, or Gilles, though an Augustinian, had sat at the feet of the Angelical Doctor for several years, following him from chair to chair. He afterwards became general of the Augustinians and Bishop of Bourges. Having been charged with the education of the Dauphin of France, who was afterwards known as Philip the Fair, he wrote this treatise on the education of a prince. The book was written before 1285. It is divided into three parts: the first treating of self government, or morals; the second of government of the family, or economics; and the third of civil government, or politics. The second part includes the subject of education. Felix Lajard pronounces it "a complete treatise on education, physical, intellectual, and moral, adapted to the different ages of the child from the cradle up."³ Going over the same ground that Pérault cultivated, and going over it in the same spirit and accord-

¹ *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, t. xix., p. 315. See *Bibliothek der Katholischen Pädagogik*, vol. iii., p. 212. Also Von Ketteler, *Die Pflichten des Adels*, Mainz, 1868.

² See Milanese, *Storia della Pedagogia*, vol. ii., p. 1491.

³ *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, t. xxx., p. 521.

ing to the same principles, it naturally follows that the same ideas are enforced in the work of Gilles. The author begins by laying stress upon the care and prudence with which the parent should guide the steps of the child in the path of truth and virtue. He dwells upon the love between father and son, which love should be the principle of obedience on the part of the son. He afterwards speaks of the instruction that should be imparted. The first and most essential is everything pertaining to religion, then good habits and good manners, then correctness of speech, and finally science. He goes through the gamut of the Trivium and Quadrivium, and adds thereto as essential for the education of a prince, metaphysics, theology, politics and ethics. Nor must we conclude from this elaborate programme, that the truly learned author—*Doctor Fundatissimus* he was called in his own day—was an impracticable theorist. He discriminates. He says: "The sons of princes should know enough of theology to confirm them in their faith; they should know well the moral sciences in order to learn therefrom how to govern themselves and others. From certain sciences they should know all that is necessary for their moral development: from grammar, enough to understand the idioms in which the truths of religion and morality are taught; from rhetoric and dialectics, all that can render their intellects prompt to apprehend, and give them facility of expression; from music, whatever can aid good manners. For the other sciences a slight acquaintance is sufficient."¹

The teacher should possess three essential qualities: he should be learned in the science of philosophy; he should know all matters that man can and ought to do, and he should be good and upright in his life. He should teach children how to speak, how to listen and how to see. Rules are laid down regarding eating and drinking and all the wants of the human body, and great caution is given concerning the avoidance of bad company. The author divides the educational period of life into three parts: first, from birth to the seventh year; second, from the seventh to the fourteenth year; third, from the age of fourteen upward. He then lays down, even to minute details, all that is requisite for the development of the body, the instruction of the mind and the education of the heart in each stage of growth. Above all, is it recommended that the teacher study the bent of the child's mind, and see that it follows that bent in a special manner. Herein Egidius agrees with the unknown author of the teacher's manual that had been attributed to Boëthius. From this principle it follows that those who have a taste for reading and study and science should

¹ *De Regimine Principum*, p. 310.

be afforded every facility to pursue their studies, while those who have no inclination for books should be exercised in arms, that they also may be able to benefit their country. Finally, in the last chapter the author treats of the education of girls, and therein lays greater stress upon their being adorned with every virtue than upon their being learned in every science; he sets his face against dancing, public promenades and loitering on the porches; instead, he would have them simple and modest, always occupied, and gracious and becoming in their manners. This book was translated by Henri de Gauchi, at the request of Philip, for the benefit of his people, and it thus became popular at an early day.¹ Thomas Occleve embodied the chief portion of the work in his poem *The Governail of Princes*.

6. But it was not only Dominicans who gave us insight into the methods of teaching practised in those days. There were Franciscans who were not less alive to the wants of the day. Take Roger Bacon (1214-1292). He saw deeply and clearly into the reality of things and the value of systems. He distinguished between what was solid and substantial in the studies and teachings of his day and the varnish and veneering that were frequently substituted for real knowledge. He does not conceal his impatience when in presence of what he considers mere pretension. Throughout his writings he keeps up a constant fusillade against his contemporaries. He finds fault with the groundwork given to boys. He assures us that thousands of boys entered the Mendicant Orders unable to read their psalter or their Latin grammar, and that forthwith, without other preparation, they were set down to the study of theology.² And then, even in the study of theology, he found Peter Lombard held in greater esteem than the Sacred Scriptures.³ Indeed, he was disgusted at seeing how men abandoned the study of theology for the more lucrative study of civil law. "Every first-rate man," he says, "having an aptitude for theology and philosophy, betakes himself to civil law, because he sees that civilians are honored by all prelates and princes."⁴ This man may be ignorant of theology and canon law but he is held in higher esteem than the master of theology and sooner elected to ecclesiastical dignities.

Bacon had no sympathy with the roundabout methods by which, at great expense of money and time, a small modicum of knowledge was acquired. He avers that in one year he could teach a promising boy all that it takes the schools twenty years to impart. He discourages the study of light literature and considers the

¹ *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, t. xxx., p. 531.

² *Opera Inedita*, pp. 425, 426.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 328, 329, 428.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 84, 418.

moral writings of Seneca and the Vulgate a better training for young men than the amatory poems of Ovid. He regards the method of teaching geometry as needlessly long and tedious.¹ He bewails the paucity of good mathematicians. He would apply experiment and mathematical calculations to physics. Natural science does not depend upon authority, but upon experiment as the only sure road to certainty. He advocates as the key to all knowledge the careful study of languages and of mathematics. Did men know the languages better there would be more precision in thought. Mathematics purges the intellectual vision and fits the learner for the acquirement of all knowledge, for mathematics is the connecting link between all the sciences.² Logic he does not consider so important; for we know it naturally, and even the uneducated syllogize.³ He goes back to the workings of the human mind, and considers the obstacles that stand in the way of acquiring human knowledge. "In the way of acquiring truth," he says, "there are four stumbling blocks which impede all wisdom whatever and scarcely permit anybody to arrive at true wisdom. They are: the force of weak and unworthy authority, prolonged custom, ignorant popular opinion, and the hiding of one's ignorance by the semblance of knowledge."⁴ Thus, out of the stray remarks running through the works of this great but too outspoken Franciscan might one construct a whole methodology far in advance of his day and generation.

7. Another eminent man who, for the instruction and edification of master and pupil, wrote in Latin verse a little treatise on school-life, was Bonvicino da Ripa. His is one of the most honored names in Milan. He had been set down as a Dominican,⁵ and it had been surmised that he was a Franciscan; but he was neither; his monument tells us that he was a distinguished member of the Third Order of Humiliati.⁶ In May, 1291, we find him assisting at a general chapter of his Order. The old chroniclers speak highly of him, as an eminent teacher in the Palatine school, in Legnano, where he erected a hospital, and in Milan. In addition, he was the first to establish in Milan, and the surrounding district, the pious custom of recalling the memory of the Incarnation at the ringing of the bells, as his eulogist expresses it,⁷ in the words of his epitaph: *qui primo fecit pulsari campanas ad Ave Maria Mediolani et in comitatu*. That same epitaph adds: *Dicatur Ave Maria pro anima ejus*.⁸ Let us not forget the pious request. Bon-

¹ *Ibid.*, 54, 56.

² *Opus Tertium*, p. 37.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 102.

⁴ *Opus Majus*, lib. i., p. 2.

⁵ Echard et Quetif, *Script. Ord. Praed.*, t. i., p. 479.

⁶ Argelati, *Bibliotheca Scriptorum*, t. ii, p. 187.

⁷ Sassi, *De Studiis Literariis Mediolanensium*, Milan, 1729, p. 94.

⁸ Argelati, *loc. cit.*

vicino was courteous, generous, devoted to the noble work of educating youth. Though he wrote Latin in a style that Sassi compliments, he was none the less an enthusiastic cultivator of the Italian, which he sought to polish, and in which he wrote, among other things in verse, a little book laying down the rules of courtesy and good behavior for children. These rules have been edited by Mr. Michael Rossetti, and published by the Early English Text Society.

Let us now glance at the poem *De Vita Scholastica*.¹ The pious author begins by stating that he would place in the hands of every student the keys by which in the pursuit of his studies he may best unlock the gate of wisdom. The edition of the poem from which the abstract is made, is subdivided under various headings. Now, the first key the author would place in the student's hands is the fear of the Lord. He lays stress upon an active faith which is based on this fear. "The devil believes, but he is wanting in this living faith." The poet next counsels the student so to control his thoughts and intentions that whatever he learns, shall be for the honor of God. It is the part of wisdom to be discreet in the use of the tongue. One should never slander; never deceive; never be vain; never boastful; never flattering; never false; never indulge in proud prating.²

The author next dwells upon the observance of humility and the avoidance of pride. He would have the student fly from jealousy; would have him grateful for favors, and forgiving of injuries; he would have him make all study subservient to the glory of God and the salvation of his soul. The poet here tells the legend of that Master Serlon of Paris, whose disciple took undue pleasure in sophisms, and undue pride in his power of logical disputation, and who, terrified at the apparition of this disciple damned for his vanity, and wearing a cloak of sophisms which crushes him to earth and consumes him, forthwith becomes converted and retires to a monastery, saying: "I leave frogs to their croaking, rooks to their cawing, and things of vanity to the vain, and henceforth I pursue that logic which fears not the Ergo of death."³

Another section of the poem exhorts the student to avoid luxury, and that vice of sodomy which was then prevalent among masters and students, and for which Dante placed his own teacher in hell. The student is counselled to be abstemious in eating and

¹ *Fratri Bonvicini Mediolanensis Vita Scholastica*, Brixie, 1585.

² *Lingua tibi non sit detractrix: subdola: vana: grandis: adulatrix: falsa: superba loquax.* p. 3.

³ "Liquo coax ranis: cras corvis: vanaque vanis;
Ad logicam pergo: quæ mortis non timet Ergo."

drinking, and is cautioned against gluttony, the wearing of delicate clothing and sleeping in a bed that is too downy and comfortable; against games of chance; against frequent balls and dances; against avarice and cupidity; against extravagance in giving, the student knowing always to whom he gives. He should regulate his senses, and fix his thoughts upon heaven that they may become worthy of heaven and filled with goodness. Stress is laid upon avoiding bad company, upon being charitable towards all, especially one's companions; the duties to be performed morning and evening, the prayers to be said; upon making the sign of the cross when one eats or drinks; upon the love and reverence due to father and mother; upon prayer to the saints and the frequent hearing of Mass.

Nor does Bonvicino overlook the teacher's duties.¹ To be worthy of his position, the first thing the master should do "If he would control his pupils, is discreetly to correct his own defects." He is to avoid all vanity, and perfect himself in his studies. The master who is lacking in sound learning, is preparing to live dishonestly. He should be discreet in correcting, nor be easily overcome by anger. Where peace and discipline are united, there are studies properly conducted. Such is the substance of this rare book.²

8. We shall find summed up in the writings of Dante what was best in the educational methods of that day. Dante (1265-1321) was born and raised in a republic in which education was general. According to Villani, fully 12,000 children out of a population of 90,000 which Florence then contained, attended school. Of these, the large majority received only an elementary training; the girls, at an early age, learning from their mothers all the various household duties, and the boys apprenticed to the trades of their fathers who transmitted to them that skill which made Florence so famous. Seven hundred young men received the higher education. The very spirit of the arts was scholastic in Dante's day. You read the story in the oratory of Orsanmichele, in which each art with its masterpiece receives a crown; you read it in the chapters of Santa Maria Novella, in Gaddi's painting of the Trivium and Quadrivium; you read it in Giotto's sculpture of the same subject upon his marvellous campanile. Here was the atmosphere in which Dante's boyhood and early manhood were passed.

It is the mission of the poet to reflect in his work the predominant, all-pervading spirit and views of his age. Now, in his day the universities were the controlling element in thought, in art, in politics, moulding the thinkers and rulers of the age both in

¹ Incipit liber secundus de Regimine Magistrorum.

² The volume from which I took this sketch is in the Mazarin Library, Paris.

Church and state. But Dante was a life-long student. He travelled from land to land and from school to school, and sat patiently and humbly at the feet of masters, imbibing whatever knowledge they could convey. He disputed in public. His bright eye and strong, sombre, reserved features attracted the attention of fellow-students as he wended his way, absorbed in his own thoughts, through the Rue du Fouarre, and entered the hall in which Sigier was holding forth.¹ Tradition has it that he was no less assiduous a frequenter of School Street in Oxford. He has left us no distinct treatise on education, but he who embodied all the science of his day, who was supreme in teaching so many other lessons, could not be silent in regard to pedagogy. From his writings a whole volume of rules and principles bearing upon education might be gleaned. In *Il Convito* he expresses himself fully on the different ages of human growth and development; speaks of obedience as an essential requisite for the child; after his father, he should obey his masters and his elders.² He should also be gentle and modest, reverent, and eager to acquire knowledge; reserved, never forward; repentant of his faults to the extent of overcoming them. As our soul in all its operations makes use of a bodily organ, it behooves us so to exercise the body that it grow in grace and aptness, and be well ordained and disposed in order that the soul may control it to the best advantage. Thus it is that a noble nature seeks to have a sound mind in a sound body.³

Dante is as faithful a disciple of St. Thomas Aquinas as is Gilles of Rome. He holds with the Angelical Doctor that the soul was made to know truth, to love and possess the good, and to enjoy the beautiful. The heart was created for the good. All indistinctly apprehend the good towards which the soul aspires and in which it would rest:

"Each one confusedly a good conceives
Wherein the mind may rest, and longeth for it;
Therefore to overtake it each one strives."⁴

Elsewhere he beautifully likens the soul seeking the good to the traveller in a strange land going from door to door expecting that each house he enters will be the inn in which he is to take lodgings; even so does the soul turn its eyes now upon one thing, now upon another, and because its knowledge is limited and fragmentary, and it sees not things in their true light, it not infrequently accepts as a great good that which in reality is very small and insignificant.⁵

¹ *Paradiso*, x., 136-138.

³ *Ibid.*, cap. 25.

⁵ *Il Convito*, tratt. iv., cap. 12.

² *Trattato*, iv., cap. 24.

⁴ *Purgatorio*, xvii., 127-129.

As the heart seeks the good, so does the intellect seek the true. The intellect was made for truth and rejoices in possession of the truth:

“And thou shouldst know that they all have delight
As much as their own vision penetrates
The Truth, in which all intellect finds rest.”¹

So also does the soul rejoice in the contemplation of the beautiful. But, as there are different degrees of goodness, so are there different degrees of beauty. The spiritual beauty of religious dogma and doctrine, for instance, as explained in the science of theology—she who “betwixt truth and mind infuses light”²—and symbolized in Beatrice, is far above beauty that appeals to the senses, and so absorbs the soul that it turns aside from all earthly forms of the fair. Here is how the poet expresses this truth:

“Then by the spirit that doth never leave
Its amorous dalliance with my lady’s looks,
Back with redoubled ardor were mine eyes
Led unto her: and from her radiant smiles,
When as I turned me, pleasure so divine
Did lighten on me, that whatever bait
Of art or nature in the human flesh,
Or in its limned resemblance, can combine
Through greedy eyes to take the soul withal,
Were to her beauty nothing.”³

But man’s senses and the faculties of his soul are developed for other purpose than that of self-gratification. Since he is made for society, and society requires various duties, various functions, various aptitudes in the arts and sciences and the diverse walks of life, then is it in the nature of things that there should be among men diversity of talents. This is the teaching of Aristotle:

“Whence he again: ‘Now say, would it be worse
For men on earth were they not citizens?’
‘Yes,’ I replied; ‘and here I ask no reason.’
‘And can they be so, if below they live not
Diversely unto offices diverse?
No, if your master writeth well for you.’”⁴

Upon this principle, based upon the nature of man as a social being, Dante builds up the great pedagogical truth that natures should not be forced into grooves for which they are unfitted; that in the choosing of a state of life one’s tastes and inclinations should be consulted; that it were unwise to compel one with a love for study and retirement to assume the career of arms, or one whose tastes are for outdoor life and industrial activity to confine himself to books. He would have him with a mechanical turn of mind de-

¹ *Paradiso*, xxviii., 106–108.

³ *Paradiso*, xxvii., 88–97, Cary’s tr.

² *Purgatorio*, vi., 46.

⁴ *Paradiso*, viii., 115–120.

vote himself to a trade; him with a bent for science devote himself to scientific pursuits; him fond of books and reading devote himself to a life of letters, and so on with other talents and other callings. In this manner will the designs of Providence be best carried out and most good accomplished. To this effect spake Charles to the poet:

“Evermore nature, if it fortune find
Discordant to it, like each other seed
Out of its region, maketh evil thrift,
And if the world below would fix its mind
On the foundation which is laid by nature,
Pursuing that, ’twould have the people good.
But you unto religion wrench aside
Him who was born to gird him with sword,
And make a king of him who is for sermons;
Therefore your footsteps wander from the road.”¹

But the whole poem recognizes the necessity of education. Dante in his own person represents humanity. He is unable to extricate himself from the dark wood or to overcome the many obstacles that beset his way without the guidance of Virgil whom he calls his master—*tu se’ lo mio maestro*²—and his pedagogue—*il dolce pedagogo*.³ Even so, humanity cannot of itself get out of the wood of error and vice and ignorance and prejudice without the aid of a master who will guide it safely and reveal to it the knowledge of things in heaven and on earth. With the schoolboy and with humanity the road to progress and liberty is through a severe tutelage.

The Franciscans made the language of the people the vehicle of spiritual thought. Dante in a happy hour made that language the medium of the highest philosophical thought and fixed its structure as a classic form of expression for all time. From that memorable twelfth day of August, in the year 1373, when the citizens of Florence petitioned the governors of the Republic “to make provision for the choosing of a man learned, capable and well-versed in the doctrine of the ‘Divina Commedia,’ to read and explain the said poem every day not a holiday during the year,” and the governors selected Boccaccio, and Bologna, Pisa, Ravenna, Piacenza, and other cities, following the example of Florence, established chairs for the study of Dante—from that day Dante became the schoolmaster of Italy, keeping alive the fire of patriotism, accustoming the people to the sublimest truths sung in noblest verse, and through good and bad fortune ever keeping before the Italian mind such a high standard of thought that whoever was familiar with Dante was possessed of an education far more complete than that imparted by Homer to the Greeks of old. There

¹ *Ibid.*, 139–149.

² *Inferno*, i., 85.

³ *Purgatorio*, xii., 3.

were intervals when the study of Dante was neglected, still the nation owning such a classic might become extinct, but it could not continue to live and neglect the precious lessons contained in that priceless treasure. Dante is no longer the educator exclusively of Italy; he is fast becoming the schoolmaster of the most cultured among the other nations of Christendom. In taking leave of Dante we shall also take leave of college life and college methods as they existed when the college was still in touch with the university.

BROTHER AZARIAS.

BROTHER AZARIAS—THRENODY.

And Thou art dead! whose deeply-visioned eyes
Knew how to win from every commonplace
Ideals softer than Italian skies;
Finding therein to trace,
Beyond the caption of our dull surmise,
Beauty and life and grace!

And Thou art gone! Thou mediæval soul,
Rich in the Faith that lived, the Art that died;
Cleansing, Isaias-like, with glowing coal
Thy lips from sin and pride,
To preach truths which, though clouds of darkness roll,
Fair as the dawn abide!

And Thou art dead! and the heart-strings are stilled
Trembling with melody—not jingling rhyme
The poet schemes at—but a music filled
With echoing Space and Time,
Deep diapason chords great Thinkers build,
Soul-mastering, sublime!

For Man was thine, with brain and heart and brawn;
Nature was thine, with bird and flower and brook;
And Space, with glowing orbs and starry lawn;
And Time, with well-writ book—
Thee from thy loves what fairer Love hath drawn
With witchery of its look?

Ah! selfish questioning! Thy clearer eye
Hath learned this visible Temple-veil to part:
Thine ear hath caught the subtler harmony
Of a diviner Art!
Thy soul hath sought to hold communion high
With Heaven's inmost heart!

HUGH T. HENRY.

ST. GREGORY THE GREAT AND ENGLAND.

THE year 540 saw Justinian gloriously reigning, having given to the world the immortal code that bears his name, having conquered Africa and shattered the power of the Goths in Italy. Important and far-reaching as were these events, there was one which took place in this year that, in the providence of God, was fraught with blessings equal to them. It was the birth of a child whose parents were noble, wealthy, and, better still, pious. His infant ears heard the salutary truths of religion from the lips of a saintly mother, and deeply did they sink into his heart to permeate his actions and make his infant life guileless and sweet as the smile of innocence. His early education was not only the best that the schools of his native city could give, but the best a father, whose attainments were considerable, could impart. He was a model pupil, for to great talents he added unwearied diligence. He soon became master of the learning of the age, especially rhetoric and philosophy. He became an adept in the civil and canon law. He was now the peer of any young man in the Byzantine empire in knowledge, rank, wealth, manly beauty, manly grace, and the superior of any in moral grandeur of character. A dazzling career was predicted for him. High and low, learning and beauty wove garlands for his brow. His fame had reached the Byzantine court, and there, despite the mists of oriental luxury and depravity, his merits won for him, at the age of thirty-four, the proud position of pretor and chief magistrate of the loved city of his birth. Had he been ambitious, worldly-minded, this exalted office, with all its splendor, with its gorgeous trabea, with all its power and honor, would have satisfied him; but from his childhood his heart was irrevocably bent on sublimer heights than those of earth. Heaven was the home of his thoughts, its sanctuaries his delight, its humble ministers his companions, whose sweet converse held him enraptured.

While still surrounded by all the glory and magnificence of office he hearkened to the voice of Christ: "If thou wilt be perfect, go, sell what thou hast, and give to the poor." The island of Sicily and the Cœlian hill evidence their fruit, and his retirement from the world soon after was a literal compliance with the further counsel of Our Saviour to the young man. The coarse garment of St. Benedict, which displaced the dazzling brilliancy of the trabea, was never worn more worthily. As he had been a

model child, a model student and a model pretor, he was now a model monk. His austerities, his devotion to the study of the Holy Scriptures, his constant vigils by the sick bed of the poor, to whom his munificent charity had given shelter and comfort, edified his brethren and increased his zeal and humility.

Much as he was admired by Rome when he wielded the sceptre of Byzantine power and wore its jewelled livery, he was far more admired when, clad in the coarse habit of his order, he attended the wants and ministered to the comfort of beggars. Honor and reverence followed his footsteps wherever directed on charitable deeds. Wherever sin, poverty and oppression cast their baleful shadows, there his footsteps tended, and there was he to be found cheering, consoling and relieving. While yet a subordinate in the monastery, which in other days had been his palace, he wends his way on a mission of mercy to the Roman forum. Ah! what a sad and harrowing scene pierces his heart on reaching it. There were gathered from every clime slaves of either sex and of varying years, from advanced manhood and womanhood to the tender age of boyhood and girlhood. Accustomed as he was to such brutal scenes, their frequency did not lessen his indignation and loathing. On other occasions these were the only feelings he displayed, but on this his countenance lights up as his gaze falls and becomes riveted on fair and shining locks mantling shapely shoulders, complexions in which the red and white roses sweetly blend, eyes whose lustrous depths seem to mirror the spirit of the skies, and features and forms from which chisel and pencil derive inspiration. This poor monk, habituated as he was to self-control, was overcome by the enthusiasm which so much loveliness created. He had the eye of an artist and the soul of an angel, and both on this occasion asserted their supremacy. He would know whence they came, what their religion and the religion of their nation. His inquiries are answered. They are from Britain; they are pagans, and Britain is a pagan land. He does not satisfy himself with sighing over their condition and exclaiming: "What evil luck that the Prince of Darkness should possess beings with an aspect so radiant, and that the grace of these countenances should reflect a soul void of the inward grace." No, they must know, believe and practice the truths of Christianity. Voicing his thoughts, he says: "These Angles have the faces of angels, and they must become the brethren of the angels in heaven." And what he resolves to do for these beautiful captives, he resolves to cause to be done or to do, and at once, for their unhappy country. He prostrates himself before the Holy Father and beseeches him to send missionaries to rescue the land of his loved Angles from the darkness and shadow of death. None are to be found. He will

go himself; he will be the martyr or the victor in the cause of its salvation. The Holy Father assents to the sacrifice, and fortified by his words of cheer and benediction, the poor monk, the enemy of slavery of what kind soever, accompanied by others of like spirit, secretly bids adieu to the home of his childhood, the glorious theatre of his temporal grandeur and spiritual triumph.

The news of his departure leaps from anguished lips until multitudes are stirred to action. Their benefactor, their model, their ornament must not be torn from them. They hurl themselves on the Holy Father, and he is borne down by their entreaties. The would-be missionary is amongst them once more, but the exultant swell of their hearts finds no response in his, dearly as he loves them. His thoughts are far away from his own sunny clime, far away by the glens and hills, the forests and marshes, the rivers and brooks of his beautiful Angles. His recall is indeed an affliction, but obedience—that great central bond of religion, that indispensable mark of monasticism—not only makes it tolerable, but sanctifies and ennobles it. He murmurs not; his vow forbids it, but his resolution to do, to dare, and, if needs be, to die, that Christ crucified shall be known in the country that now possesses his affections, his aspirations, his holy ambition, is unalterable.

The years roll on, and with them come honor and fame. Now we find him in the dazzling but corrupting court of Byzantium, confronting the great, the powerful, the crafty, and winning victories and encomiums from them; again, within the hallowed walls of St. Andrea, an exemplar of every monastic virtue and austerity; but, wherever found, “the still small voice” that first whispered its mission of benediction into his ravished ears in the Roman forum, is never stilled. It holds him, it has become his master, and we may well imagine him, asking, “How long, O Lord, how long will thy salvation be withheld from the country of the children of my affection?”

Not long. From out the carnival of plague a divine gleam illumines the horizon of the Church. Pelagius II. goes down in its ruthless march, and senate, and people, and clergy, are a unit in naming the successor of the fallen pontiff. Gregory is now the pilot of the bark of Peter, and though the winds and waves of passion rise around it, though the rocks of heresy and schism threaten it, though false lights and snares try to lure it, he stands calmly at the helm, his eye beaming with celestial intelligence, his heart aflame with divine love, and over wind and wave, and rocks, false lights and snares, his master hand and master mind guide it to victory and to glory. Matchless pilot! who never disregarded the signal of distress, no matter what thunders rolled, what lightnings flashed, what tempests raged; who never heard the cry of

agony from the lips of the enslaved, no matter how strong the pirate craft, without attempting relief; who steered into every peril, at whatever cost, to bring solace, light, and freedom to suffering humanity; who ever followed law, virtue and truth, as a polar star; and who made the bark of Peter so seaworthy through centuries of darkness, storm, and blood, that the world has added Great, and the Church, Saint, to the name of Gregory. Happy Gregory! Glorious pilot of the bark of Peter! For, thee, the day of longing is past, and that of realization dawned. Light and life are now thine to bestow upon the land whose captive children elicited thy rapturous admiration, years ago, in the Roman forum.

We have thus lengthily dwelt on the early career of Gregory, because we think his life furnishes a key to the conduct of the missionaries he selected for the evangelization and civilization of England. His piety and humility, tolerance and liberality, varied and profound learning, experience in the world, and deep insight into human character, devotion to duty, and ability to adjust his course to circumstances where no principle was involved, his hatred of slavery, and pertinacity in the pursuit of an object, his superhuman capacity to see difficulties and to provide remedies—all these elements of greatness of soul and intellect were brought into prominent play in the conversion of England.

And, first in the monastery—over which he presided—a monastery which his heroic charity had dedicated to religion, and from which he selected the men who were to execute his long-cherished designs. Gregory was not like the great bulk who compose the monastic life. As a rule, they are marked out from infancy for their calling, and carefully guarded against all worldly influence, and taught to shun its experience as contamination. They are hot-house plants, assiduously shielded from every blighting blast, every scorching ray, every withering frost. As a rule, also, the men who embrace the monastic state late in life, are seldom untarnished by contact with the world. They bring dangerous habits and bitter memories into the cloister, where its inexperienced inmates soon learn their past, which the mantle of charity never entirely obscures, unless they find Pauls or Augustines, which is rarely the case.

To these rules Gregory was a gloriously brilliant exception. In every respect, his past was as stainless as the purest. There were no memories to impair his usefulness, or to counteract the ascendancy of his magnificent abilities. Saint, scholar and sage, he was to the monastery from beginning to end. It was, therefore, eagerly predisposed to accept with profound reverence and with childlike docility his teaching.

If it be ordinarily true, that faithful pupils reflect the moral and

intellectual qualities of the teachers, how much more so is it of the pupils who are bound by vow to hear and practice the lessons of one who is not only a teacher, but a superior, whom to disobey were a most grievous offence.

As a matter of fact, not only every obstacle was removed that could, in any way, obstruct his moulding them in his own image and likeness, but every facility was afforded him to that end. Nature and grace co-operated to make his efforts in this regard a remarkable success. His sentiments, ideas, and very spirit, which art has symbolized by a dove, were theirs, and theirs for a specific purpose. Whilst it is true that he exerted himself to form Anglo-Saxon youths for his long-cherished project, they were not to be leaders, but aiders in the work. More he did not look for, and this he abandoned. The men selected would adorn any age of the world. Even the acrimonious and bigoted Thierry admits that they were men of tried faith and solid learning.

Thus grandly tutored, they needed, in the work before them, every moral and intellectual element of its strength. The pagan inhabitants of Britain were unlike the branches of the Germanic race that settled on the Continent. They had no knowledge of Roman language, literature, or law, and no respect whatever for the Roman name. If the picture furnished by Tacitus, and so implicitly accepted by many who ought to know better, be a faithful likeness of any of the tribes or nations of that indomitable race, it certainly is no likeness of the Jutes, Angles and Saxons. No pleasing associations cluster around their memories, from the earliest accounts of them until after the coming of Augustine. Obscure and inconsiderable at first, they became, in the course of time, formidable, increasing in terror as they increased in strength. Murder, pillage, and piracy were the routine of their lives, which were brutally sensual and devoid almost of any ennobling element.

The Saxons, with their allies from the Skager Rack to the limits of France, from the Saale to the western frontier of Bohemia, ravaged like demons every coast upon which their ships touched. Those whom they spared from instant death were reduced to the most horrible species of slavery, or sacrificed, with a barbarity shocking and inhuman, on the altars of their monster gods. Courage, such as beasts have, they possessed; of courage in its better and nobler meaning they were entirely devoid. This beastly courage was their only title to virtue, if virtue it can be called, and its absence their only vice. Craft, skill and daring, which would be laudable when exercised in legitimate pursuits, they unquestionably had. It was, however, the craft, skill and daring of the burglar, the assassin and the ravisher. Its victories were victories

such as fiends delight in. Life, liberty and property were its trophies, and wailing humanity its triumphal song. Magnanimity and compassion had no place in its texture. Self was its father and ferocity its support. The sentiment of personal liberty, of human individualism, for which say eloquent declaimers the world is indebted to the Germanic race, was, to use the phrase of Guizot, "mere selfishness in all its brutality; with all its unsociability." In their theology there was nothing that made life better. Their heaven was a heaven of gluttony and revolting cruelty; their hell a place of abstinence and quiet. Such were the Saxons as Rome knew them, and such they were, and such were the Jutes and Angles when, after years of war, they had established their language, institutions, laws and religion where Roman civilization had reigned in comparative triumph for centuries.

They were not improved by the conquest, if conquest it can be called—a conquest unique even in the history of their own race. The obstinate resistance which they met increased their ferocity and whetted their cruelty. Extermination or slavery was the fate of the poor Briton, and when he no longer furnished them means of vengeance or of profit, they turned on their own flesh and blood, as the incident of the Roman forum, to which we have already alluded, serves to show, and the slave markets of the time attest. Not a trace of British Christianity or of Roman civilization was to be found in the territory occupied by them. Paganism, brutal and abhorrent, governed a nature from which ages of warfare had eliminated almost every ennobling element.

That we are guilty of no injustice in this presentment, the following extract from Dr. Lingard's "Anglo-Saxon Church" will, we think, establish: "By the ancient writers," he says, "the Saxons are unanimously classed with the most barbarous of the nations which invaded and dismembered the Roman empire. Their valor was disgraced by its brutality. To the services they generally preferred the blood of their captives; and the man whose life they condescended to spare was taught to consider perpetual servitude as a gratuitous favor. Among themselves, a rude and imperfect system of legislation intrusted to private revenge the punishment of private injuries; and the ferocity of their passions continually multiplied these deadly and hereditary feuds. Avarice and the lust of sensual enjoyment had extinguished in their breasts some of the first feelings of nature. The savages of Africa may traffic with Europeans for the negroes whom they have seized by treachery or captured in open war; but the more savage conquerors of the Britons sold, without scruple, to the merchants of the continent, their countrymen, and even their own children. Their religion was accommodated to their manners, and their manners were per-

petuated by their religion. In their theology they acknowledged no sin but cowardice and revered no virtue but courage. Their gods they appeased with the blood of human victims. Of a future life their notions were faint and wavering, and if the soul were fated to survive the body, to quaff ale out of the skulls of their enemies was to be the great reward of the virtuous; to lead a life of hunger and inactivity the endless punishment of the wicked.¹

Lamentable and disheartening indeed as was the real condition of England, which Dr. Lingard has thus so moderately yet truthfully sketched, accounts of a most exaggerated character reached the missionaries on their journey and filled them with alarm. Nature for a time asserted itself over the teaching of Gregory, but its sway was of short duration. Had they not been overwhelmed by the horrible tales poured into their ears, they never would, knowing him as they did, have sought from him a release from what to flesh and blood seemed a hopeless mission. His life was an open book to them, and if it taught anything more impressively than another, it was, that a resolution once formed, in a matter of great moment, was never abandoned. With the real condition of England he was long acquainted, and therefore, the feverish stories which had caused his disciples to forget themselves could have no weight with him.

Admitting their truth, however, we believe that his command would still be forward, for his reliance was on God, though he neglected no human means in His cause. The perils complained of only enhanced the glory of the mission in his eyes, which nothing but its utter uselessness could cause him to relinquish, and utter uselessness could never be predicated of sacrifice. The blood of the martyrs had never been, and never would be, shed in vain. The objections are futile; the work must go on. "Forward," he writes to them, "in God's name! . . . The more you have to suffer, the brighter will your glory be in eternity. May the grace of the Almighty protect you, and grant to me to behold the fruit of your labors in the eternal country; if I cannot share your toil, I shall none the less rejoice in the harvest, for God knows I lack not good will."

Had he been weak and vacillating, had not divine love entirely mastered him, had he not possessed an extraordinarily clear head and clean heart, the evangelization of England would have been then and there abandoned. However, difficulties only heightened his zeal. Henceforth he will be with them, and with them to the end, no matter what distractions, annoyances, and bitter crosses—and they were such as rarely fall to the lot of any man—weigh

¹ *Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 33.

on him, to cheer, to enlighten, to govern. Now he brings his distinguished character and distinguished services into play, and make them subserve the cause of England. The missionaries are furnished with letters not only to famed prelates but to crowned heads, who vie in doing them honor, more as a mark of esteem for Gregory than for any other motive. Their march through France to the coast partakes of the nature of a triumph. Queen Brunhild and her sons do everything to facilitate the work of heroic charity, which they have with a will worthy of their master resumed—a master who is at once their father, their abbot, and their pope. This triple bond is now to remain as indissoluble as the marriage tie, and it was well for England and the human race that it was so.

When they erected the standard of redemption in the isle of Thanet, where long ago the Roman Eagle was first given to the breeze of Britain, and, later, the bloody ensign of Saxon ferocity floated, a menace to civilization of what kind soever, they felt that they were not entire strangers in a strange land. The power of grand deeds and a grand name had preceded them, and the humble followers of Christ felt that Rome the Eternal, with its magnificent pontiff in whom every element of greatness centered, had a prestige, in one sense, equal to that of Rome the Imperial. And why not? Behold how equipped. With a government and organization perfect as divine and human wisdom could make it, with a legislation rooted in eternal justice, the embodiment of revelation, the perfection of reason and the wisdom of experience—with a priesthood from which no rank was excluded, but chiefly composed of the humbler classes, presenting a solidarity unique and admirable, an *esprit de corps* not of earth, trampling upon mammon, lust, and disobedience, the three most powerful forces in the destruction of man in the spiritual and temporal order, illustrating by its life the possibility and beauty of the opposite virtues, going wherever misery and sorrow needed solace, wherever injustice, whether robed in purple or skulking from outraged law, needed reproof, master of every art, profoundly versed in the learning of antiquity, moving and acting at the command of a judicious, learned, and saintly episcopate, its own choice, with a discipline and devotion worthy of the finest cohort of the finest days of the republic—with means for its work over which presided a pope who, from whatever point of view regarded, knew no superior among the rulers in church or state who preceded him. This organization thus perfect, Gregory and the forces which his genius had created were in the field against a barbarism that was odious to the continent, that had no bond save self and little law other than passion. The evils dreaded, and that caused the remonstrance

from Provence, vanished as they calmly considered the situation. And as the star of Queen Bertha, the daughter of the King of Paris, and the granddaughter of St. Clotilda, illumined the horizon—a star which was long visible to Gregory—their joy and hope received an impetus which only complete disaster could check. This was not to be looked for, and they went to meet her husband chanting the canticles of mother Church in the grand strains of their father, their abbot, and their pope. The star of Bertha triumphed, and the peerless sagacity and devotion of Gregory was rewarded by the baptism of Ethelbert, than which, says Montalembert, “since the baptism of Constantine, and excepting that of Clovis, there had not been any event of greater moment in the annals of Christendom.”¹ This baptism sealed the fate of paganism, and the light of Christianity dawned never more to be extinguished. Immortal Gregory! Sweet Bertha! Glorious Augustine! Grand trinity! Heaven’s gleam is on your labors, and the brutal and obscene deities cower in your radiance as they flee to their native darkness.

The ecstatic rapture with which Gregory received from Laurence and Peter the news of the conversion of Ethelbert and the kingdom of Kent, as his letter to Augustine, to the patriarch of Alexandria and Queen Bertha manifest, was to be expected from one whose faculties and affections, tears and prayers, had ever been with England from the day that his eyes beheld her beautiful children in the Roman forum. From these letters we deem it necessary to make a few extracts, because they not only serve to establish his enthusiasm, gratitude, appreciation of zeal, perseverance, spirit, but profound policy, from a worldly point of view, in his dealings with the chosen instruments in the work of Christianization and civilization. To omit his tribute to Queen Bertha would be an act of ingratitude from which we shrink. Gregory and Bertha are inseparably associated, and, after God, theirs the glory. The one was the Moses, the other the Mary of England.

To Augustine he says: “Glory be to God in the highest, glory to that God who would not reign alone in heaven, whose death is our life, whose weakness is our strength, whose suffering cures our sufferings, whose love sends us to seek even in the island of Britain for brothers whom we knew not, whose goodness causes us to find those whom we sought for while yet we knew them not. Who can express the exultation of all faithful hearts now that the English nation, through the grace of God and thy brotherly labor, is illumined by the divine light, and tramples under foot the idols which it ignorantly worshiped in order that it may now bow down before the true God.”

¹ *Monks of the West*, vol. ii., p. 156.

"The bearer of your letters," he writes to the Patriarch of Alexandria, "found me sick, and leaves me sick. But God grants to me gladness of heart to temper the bitterness of my bodily sufferings. The flock of the Holy Church grows and multiplies; the spiritual harvest gathers in the heavenly garnerns. . . . You announce to me the conversion of your heretics—the concord of your faithful people. . . . I make you a return in kind, because I know you will rejoice in my joy, and that you have aided me with your prayers. Know, then, that the nation of the Angles, situated at the extremest *angle* of the world, had till now continued in idolatry, worshiping stocks and stones. God inspired me to send thither a monk of my monastery here, to preach the gospel to them. This monk, whom I caused to be ordained Bishop by the Frankish Bishops, has penetrated to this nation at the uttermost ends of the earth, and I have now received tidings of the happy success of his enterprise. He and his companions have wrought miracles that seem to come near those of the Apostles themselves, and more than 10,000 English have been baptized by them at one time."

His letter to Bertha is worthy of him, a fitting eulogy and zealous exhortation, in which the spirit of the skies and the wisdom of earth sweetly blend: "Our very dear sons, Laurence the priest, and Peter the monk, have rehearsed to me, on their arrival here, all that your majesty has done for our reverend brother and co-Bishop, Augustine—all the comfort and the charity that you have so liberally bestowed on him. We bless the Almighty, who has seen meet to reserve for you the conversion of the English nation. Even as He found in the glorious Helena, mother of the most pious Constantine, an instrument to win over the hearts of the Romans to the Christian faith, so, we feel assured, will His mercy, through your agency, work out the salvation of the English. Already, for a long time, it must have been your endeavor to turn, with the prudence of a true Christian, the heart of your husband towards the faith which you profess, for his own well being and that of his kingdom. Well instructed and pious as you are, this duty should not have been to you either tedious or difficult. If you have in any wise neglected it, you must redeem the lost time. Strengthen in the mind of your noble husband his devotion to the Christian faith; pour into his heart the love of God, inflame him with zeal for the complete conversion of his subjects, so that he may make an offering to Almighty God by your love and your devotion. I pray God that the completion of your work may make the angels in heaven feel the same joy which I already owe to you on earth."¹

¹ Cited in *Monks of the West*, vol. ii, pp. 162, 163.

The conquerors on the bloody field of battle have been such because of the respect, confidence and enthusiasm with which they fired and sustained the valor of their soldiers. The Hannibals, Alexanders and Cæsars owe their victories to this cause. Surely the general who neglects his soldiers, who will not applaud and reward merit, cannot expect that devotion by which alone battles are won. Now what is true of temporal warfare is to a certain extent true of spiritual warfare. The soldier of the Cross is human as well as the soldier of the State, and though he may be less so, so long as flesh and blood environ his spirit, so long will he need the kind word, the hearty grasp, and the "God bless you," which cost little and go far. This Gregory fully understood, as these letters abundantly attest, and to their judicious use much of his success is attributable.

But now a new era opens—an era requiring the display of the consummate abilities, great tact and wisdom which the world and the cloister had developed. Questions arise that not only require the spirit of the Apostle, but the genius of the jurist and the statesman. To say that Gregory was prepared for the emergency would be unnecessary after the sketch we have presented in the commencement. The Church had not only to be extended, but organized and directed, and society established on a Christian basis. For its extension, men and means were liberally furnished, and every influence invoked. Power, learning and the arts were called into requisition, a library founded, and a policy inaugurated that would shed lustre even on this century of enlightenment. No human aids were despised or neglected, if legitimate and clearly conducive to the result sought: namely, the present and future growth of Christ's kingdom. Bloodshed and cruelty must be avoided. Therefore the violence and force which so often disgraced the propagation of religion, where blind zeal wielded the rod of power, was unknown, and Ethelbert, though in a position to compel compliance, set an example which, for moderation and tolerance, has scarcely a parallel in the history of royal converts similarly situated. The course pursued is so fittingly portrayed in a letter written by a monk of Malmesbury to St. Boniface, one hundred and fifty years after the arrival of St. Augustine, and so evidences the continuing spirit of Gregory in the Anglo-Saxon Church, that we gladly cite it. "To overcome," he says, "the obstinacy of heathen savages—to fertilize the stony and barren soil of their hearts—pains must be taken not to insult or irritate them, but to set our doctrines before them with unflinching moderation and gentleness, so as to make them blush at their foolish superstitions without exasperating them."¹

¹ *Monks of the West*, vol. ii., p. 601.

To his keen conception of the essential and accidental, much good is owing. Few minds grasped their distinguishing difference so clearly, and few men would have the courage, under the circumstances in which he was placed, to act on the line of this difference. The occasions were numerous calling for the exercise of this faculty, and that its exercise was unerring and beneficial admits of no question.

There have been those who have assailed him, in envenomed phrase, for using the temples of the idols, and sanctioning the slaughter of oxen even for a legitimate purpose. We beg leave to differ with these spiritual Quixotes, and though we have no knowledge of theology, except such as was necessary in order to be permitted to make our first communion, we will risk the assertion that, all things considered, Gregory could not order the destruction of those temples without being guilty of sin. That there was anything wrong in dedicating them to the service of God, no amount of ingenious argumentation could make out even a plausible case. How the killing of oxen and the eating of them on occasions named could be reprehensible, is not apparent. What is apparent, however, is Gregory's magnificent insight into human nature, nice discernment of the adaptation of means to an end without the sacrifice of Catholic truth, and we heartily say with him: "It is impossible to change all at once the whole habits of the savage mind; a mountain is not climbed by leaps and bounds, but step by step."

The answer to the eleven questions which Augustine propounded to him, is a monument worthy of all the exalted qualities of heart and intellect which we have claimed for him, and subsequent ages have shown their appreciation of it, by making it the law for the guidance of missionaries in heathen lands. In it his liberality, charity and finely balanced judgment are especially conspicuous. Whatever he found good, its adaptation was counselled, no matter what its origin, or where practiced, so long as it did not encroach on the essential verities of Catholic doctrine. The question with him was, whether it would promote the honor and glory of God and the lasting foundation of His kingdom. This answered affirmatively, all prejudices were flung to the winds. In his decision the genius and habits of the people were taken into consideration. When criticized for introducing into the Church of Rome customs that prevailed at Constantinople, his reply is so beautiful for its humility, so valuable for its wisdom and so characteristic of his course in building and consolidating the Anglo-Saxon Church, that we joyfully present it to our readers. "I shall," he says, "be always ready to deter my subordinates from evil, but to imitate them in good, borrowing it from, it matters not what

Church. He is but a fool who could make his primacy a reason for disdaining to learn whatever good can be learnt."¹ His regard for the dignity of the episcopal office, solicitude for the temporal independence of the clergy, humane concern for the relief of the poor, charity in dealing with sacrilegious robbers whom the civil law punished with great severity, his especial attention to the sanctity of the marriage-bed; all these and other subjects of equal weight, to which his answer relates are so well known that we will not dwell on them. Moreover, such details do not enter into the scope of this article, and to some of them prudery might object.

One of the grandest of the many grand traits of Gregory's character, and which deserves special mention, is his fidelity to the leader whom he had chosen to execute his commands. All renowned commanders in Church or State, whether from policy or principle, have exhibited this trait in a remarkable degree. The unhappy conflict that recently threatened the integrity, usefulness and glory of our republic furnishes an illustrious instance of this in the person of Ulysses S. Grant. He never deserted a general in whom he had reason to confide, and the dazzling exploits of the Shenandoah Valley, before which romance pales, and the happy outcome of the march from Atlanta to the sea are its golden harvest. Sheridan and Sherman are its laurels. To the one he gave full rein, to the other he brought a balm for wounds that ingratitude had inflicted—wounds that might have dwarfed the colossal stature upon which we gaze to day with wonder, admiration and pride, and which, to generations yet unborn, will stand out like a Pharos in the night of the past.

This trait, so productive of good results, was never exemplified to a greater extent than by Gregory, and it is but just to add, especially since slanderous pens have made free with Augustine's memory, that never was a more worthy object presented for its exercise. From the moment of his selection Gregory never ceased to aid, cheer and console him, and the obedience of Augustine was entire and absolute. When constituting him metropolitan over twelve bishoprics to be erected in the south, the same number in the north, he says in giving him jurisdiction over all the bishops of Britain that he does so "in order that they may learn by your word and by your life what they must believe, and how they must live, in order to fulfil their office and gain an inheritance in Heaven"²

What higher testimony of worth could be given? His letter to Ethelbert is more explicit, but not more forcible, for the authority

¹ Cited in *Monks of the West*, vol. ii., p. 170.

² *Monks of the West*, p. 166, vol. ii.

conferred holds a language stronger than any combination of words. "You have with you," he says, "our very reverend brother bishop Augustine, trained according to the monastic rule, full of the knowledge of the Scriptures, abounding in good works in the sight of God. Hearken devoutly to him, and faithfully accomplish all that he tells you ; for the more you listen to what he will tell you on the part of God, the more will God grant his prayers when he prays to Him on your behalf. Attach yourself, then, to him with all the strength of your mind, and all the fervor of faith ; and second his efforts with all the force that God has given you."¹

Notwithstanding this evidence, which is only a tithe of what could be adduced, the brilliant but erratic Thierry, a crabbed carper at Catholic practices, sees something that savors of jealousy in Gregory's letter to Augustine regarding the miracles that attended his preaching of the gospel, where no right-minded man could discern aught else than a fatherly solicitude for his spiritual welfare. The fears of Gregory were the fears of the Apostles, and his advice has the ring of the apostolic spirit as well as the authority of Him who inspired it. Thierry's innuendo is worthy of the cowardly ruffianism that could detect a political purpose in the work of England's evangelization—a ruffianism almost peculiar to French apostates, and for which, the glory they enthrone is disregarded that they may indulge its gratification. Self should have no place in history, and the Thierrys who cannot, or will not, crush it, had better devote their talents to some other pursuit.

In this connection we wish to notice another calumny which has an important bearing on the Anglo-Saxon church—a church noted for its love of learning, a calumny to which Hallam, whose works are generally read, has given currency, namely, that Gregory had contempt for literature and science. If the sketch we have given in the opening be correct—and there can be no doubt of its correctness—he was master of all the learning of the period. When did he develop an antipathy to his early training ? There is no evidence that he ever did. On the contrary, to the last hour of his life he was as firm a believer in the power of all knowledge for good, as is to-day the erudite and eloquent rector of the Catholic University at Washington. While it is true that he condemned exclusive attention to profane literature, his utterances prove that he strongly favored its study. "The devils know well," he says, "that the knowledge of profane literature helps us to understand sacred literature. In dissuading from this study, they act as the

¹ *Monks of the West*, vol. ii., pp. 165, 166.

Philistines did, when they interdicted the Israelites from making swords or lances, and obliged that nation to come to them for the sharpening of their axes and ploughshares.”¹

But was the foundation of the Anglo-Saxon church his only work? He was the founder of the Anglo-Saxon state also—a state whose institutions and laws have survived the ravages and butcheries of the Danes, the tyranny and robbery of the Normans, the degrading theories and diabolical practices of the Tudors, the mad arrogance and perverse obstinacy of the Stuarts and the hellish craft and iron hand of Cromwell. They are to be found wherever England’s flag floats, and England’s language is spoken. They are the germs of the glorious liberty which the starry banner symbolizes and protects, and will be perpetuated with it so long as honor, intelligence and sterling manhood prevail on American soil—the soil in whose bosom they were nourished into life when torn from their native bed, withering and dying.

We have said that Gregory was an adept in the civil law. Now when he conceived the design of the evangelization of England—a design thwarted by the affections of the Roman people, he never, for a single instant abandoned it. He constantly looked forward to the day when he should be in a position to accomplish it, and the knowledge of the civil law which he had, he imparted to those who would embark in his hazardous undertaking. That many of them were civilians of considerable skill is beyond doubt, and the code of laws known as the *Dooms* or *Judgments of Ethelbert* is mainly their work. In the organization of society on a Christian basis the training and guidance of Gregory are everywhere manifest, and if the Anglo-Saxon state reached that symmetry and perfection claimed for it, may we not assert that it was owing to the solid foundation laid?

On every subject pertaining to government Gregory had most comprehensive and most liberal views. He was far in advance of his time, especially on the subject of slavery—a subject of so much importance in the early ages that we will indulge in a seeming digression.

Slavery was the curse of the ancient world. It covered it like a deluge. Its victims were everywhere, no matter what the religious belief, no matter what the form of the government, no matter what the intellectual development. Groans and sighs were heard, fettered limbs and fettered souls were witnessed on Mount Moria and on Mount Sion, in the shadow of the Areopagus and the Roman Forum, by the gates of Thebes and the waters of Babylon. True, Jerusalem was the city of God, true, Athens was the city of all

¹ *Monks of the West*, vol. i., p. 393.

that the world prizes most, art, science, literature, philosophy, wealth, valor, beauty; and Rome, sitting queenly on her seven hills, was the city of the world, was the world. Yet these cities thus blessed were cursed with the curse of curses, human slavery. Terrible and loathsome as we know it to have been in Portuguese, Spanish, Dutch, and English colonies, it was far less so than that which flourished, rotted, and ruined the ancient world. For it, there was no land of promise; its vision was forever circumscribed by the horizon of the desert, until the canticle of the angels was heard over the stable of Bethlehem of Juda proclaiming, "glory to God in the highest and peace on earth to men of good will." Though a profound tranquility reigned throughout the Roman world, and the temple of Janus was shut for the third time in seven hundred years, when this stupendous event occurred which brought down the choir of heaven—though Rome was in the zenith of its power, revelling in its spoils and trophies, glorying in its literature and arts, her eagles everywhere victorious, with no enemy to fear and no foe to dare, she presented an appalling spectacle to the philanthropist and moralist, a spectacle that only omnipotence could change.

And for this, as well as for opening the gates of heaven, which the sin of Adam had closed, did Omnipotence put on the garb of humanity, to be cradled in a manger, to work at the carpenter's bench, to go about among the poor and the lowly doing good, having not whereon to lay His head, to be mocked, scourged and crucified. With the poor, the oppressed, the afflicted His life was spent, and with their's it was identified. Their cause was His cause, their sorrows His sorrows. His manners, habits, associations, teaching and practice were a protest against the governing classes of the day. Intolerance found a rebuke in the words: "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of," addressed to His disciples when they besought Him to call down fire from heaven to consume a village of Samaria because it had shut its doors against Him. The fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, antagonized by caste and slavery, He emphasized by word and example. If the Sermon on the Mount teaches anything, it teaches this. He had a balm for every wound, a punishment for every wrong. In His sight all men were equal, and exact justice was required of all. Property in man was condemned. "Know the truth and the truth shall make you free," had a two-fold application. Slavery and truth are incompatible; truth and freedom are parent and child. Slavery is darkness, truth is light, and as the light chases darkness, so does truth chase slavery. "Love thy neighbor as thyself," "Whatsoever you would that men should do to you, do you also to them" were commands alike to all, no mat-

ter what their condition in life, no matter whether acting as natural or artificial persons—commands, the observance of which would make slavery an impossibility. States, kings and princes were to be responsible to Him, were to be governed by His law, which was to endure as long as time, perpetuated by the Church of which he constituted the fisherman, Peter, head—a Church with which He promised to abide until the consummation of the world. Well, indeed, has that Church battled to perform all the duties for which she was instituted, and notably well has she battled against the giant evil, slavery, that everywhere confronted her infant gaze—an evil so antagonistic to the spirit and teachings of her divine founder. The doctrines of St. Paul, as understood by her, triumphed over the degrading doctrines of Plato and Aristotle, and everywhere potent voices were heard proclaiming the dignity and rights of man. But of all the voices raised in this cause throughout centuries of darkness, none was more powerful, more enthusiastic, more persistent, more in consonance with the spirit and teaching of Christ, than that of Gregory. "Since the Redeemer and Creator of the world," he says, "made Himself Incarnate in the form of humanity in order to break the chain of our slavery by the grace of freedom, and to restore us to our pristine liberty, it is well and wise to restore the benefit of original liberty to men whom nature has made free and whom the laws of men have bowed under the yoke of servitude."¹ He was emphatically the champion of freedom, and Christian, Jew and Pagan were alike the recipients of his services. Heart, hand and voice were at the command of all the children of misfortune, without regard to creed or nationality. Had it been otherwise, he would have been unfit for the work of England's christianization and social organization. Great as was his hatred of slavery, the condition of England needed it—a condition, if possible, worse than disgraced any nation of the ancient world, and without the amelioration of which no permanent church or state could be formed. That his disciples shared his detestation of it we can readily believe, especially since its continuance, in its then condition, was incompatible with Christianity and a Christian state. That they had some of his enthusiasm for complete liberty can hardly be doubted, when all their relations with him are taken into consideration, and that to the seed sown by them its entire abolition in every form of its cursed existence, after centuries of contention, is owing.

The Anglo-Saxon state, in its best features, is the product of the Anglo-Saxon Church, and Gregory is the corner-stone of both. There was in him every element of moral and intellectual strength

¹ Epist. vi., 12.

that the successful building of both required. The achievements and fame of both are his eulogy, and though they are only a small part of it—for other lands lay claim to him—no man could desire more. Happy the day for England and the human race that his footsteps tended to the Roman forum, where the loveliness of countenance and figure entranced his vision and inspired his soul with a noble, a heroic purpose. No incident in history has led to more glorious results, to more lasting conquests for God and humanity, and with them the name of Gregory must be forever associated.

MICHAEL HENNESSY.

THE CHURCH AND THE EMPIRE A.D. 250-312.

WHAT was the actual condition of the Christian Church when, early in the fourth century, the Edicts of Nicomedia were issued against her? The question is an extremely important one, for in the succeeding age imperial favor, subtlest heresies, multitudes of semi-Christians and decrease of charity gave quite another physiognomy to the Christian body. On the other hand, the sources of our information for the later period flow so fully that we cannot mistake the essential outlines of faith, discipline and organization, while there remain only fragmentary evidences for the heroic age of Christianity, over every one of which a jealous and interested criticism maintains the strictest watch. It is the intention of the writer to draw an outline of Christianity in those early ages, not precisely from the genetic point of view, but rather to present the religion of Christ as it must have seemed to an intelligent and impartial observer in the closing years of the third century—such, perhaps, as it may have appeared to the son of Constantius Chlorus while he travelled in the body-guard of the Illyrian Cæsar through Egypt and Syria, or hastened in memorable flight across the heart of the empire from Byzantium to York. The moment is a propitious one, for both within and without the Church certain lines of evolution had then reached their last term. The subtle, poisonous influence of the Orient, conveyed through a hundred forms of Docetism and Gnosticism, had been dissipated by the united and intelligent efforts of the Christian episcopate and the writings of learned Christians. The episcopate itself, now a mighty network, frequently co-ordinate with

the municipal system of the empire, was fully conscious of its own nature and mission. An immense sympathy, wide as the world and supremely intense, pulsated throughout the whole body from the humblest *episcopi gentium* on the borders of Scythia or Arabia to the successor of the Fisherman. Conflict and contradiction had drawn out all the latent energies of the Christian system, and as the mind wanders over the contents of the Christian literature of the period, the thinker is astonished at seeing that all the domestic and mixed questions which will eventually convulse Christendom, and even yet disturb the peace of mankind, were in those dim days troubling the minds of our predecessors. Whoever will turn over the voluminous index of a book as remarkable as dangerous¹ may convince himself that within the first three centuries the Christian Church had been called on to face, at least in embryonic form, the most painful internal and external problems, and that she solved them with a firmness and accuracy that betray a rounded and plenary consciousness of her sublime mission and her supreme authority. Among the thousand scattered communities of Christians there was a strong sense of mutual fraternity, of solidary fellowship—the outcome of the common teachings and sufferings of ten generations. Never since then has there been so little jealousy, so little mutual distrust, so loving, frequent and intimate communication, ignoring all the local and transitory interests of earthly politics. Antioch and Alexandria recognized without demur the spiritual hegemony of Rome, and with maternal affection the latter sheltered in her bosom the multitudinous Christian visitors whom business or curiosity or piety led to the Golden Queen.²

On the other hand, the relations of the Roman state to Christianity, after much uncertainty and tergiversation, had at last reached a crucial point, when the opposing claims of Christ and Cæsar must be settled, either by peaceful means or by the dread

¹ Renan: *Les Origines du Christianisme*. 8 vols. Paris, 1891. On the Christian side there is, as yet, no such brilliant and comprehensive synthesis of a multitude of excellent monographs. But the *Origines Chrétiennes* of the learned Abbé Duchesne; the works of Professor Probst of Breslau, on doctrine, prayer, liturgy, the sacraments and discipline in the first three centuries; the *Histoire des Persécutions*, by Allard; the *Geschichte der Roemischen Kirche* by Hagemann; the *Hippolytus und Callistus* of Doellinger, contain valuable antidotes to the Renanesque virus. Priceless material is stored up in the *Bulletino di archeologia Cristiana* of De Rossi.

² Cf. Eusebius H. E., viii., 7. St. Athanasius; *On the Opinion of Dionysius*, c. 13. *De Synodis*, c. 43. Euseb. H. E., vii. 30; iv. 23; v. 24. Fresh light has been thrown on the ecclesiastical supremacy of Rome by the discovery of the second century Epitaph of Abercius. See Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, SS. Ignatius and Polycarp, vol. i., pp. 493-501, and the *Catholic Times* of Philadelphia, April 29, 1893, p. 4: *The Inscription of Abercius*. The proofs of the Roman supremacy are gathered in the first volume of Harnack's *Dogmengeschichte*, and illustrated by Hagemann in *Die Roemische Kirche* (Freiburg, 1864) and Schroedl, *Papstgeschichte* (Mainz, 1888.)

and dangerous arbitrament of blood. Perhaps it was the clear sense of the finality of his act which made the politic son of Diocles hesitate so long on the eve of the combat, and exhaust every weaker makeshift before opening the last campaign of ethnicism against the sweet and humble law of Christ. It was surely this conviction which caused the warfare to be carried on against the Christians not as offending citizens of a common state, but as hostile belligerents.¹ The supreme hour had come for the death struggle between Christian monotheism and the motley polytheism of the Gentile world, between the principles of individual spiritual liberty of conscience and absolute civic omnipotence, between the City of God and the City of Man. The Roman State of the first century looked upon the Christians with a supercilious contempt, scarcely distinguishing them from the vile herd that congregated in the Jewries of the Suburra and the Trastevere. As the evil grew, and the sensual mongrel populations of the great cities began to suspect what Christianity meant, sedition and uproar so filled the empire that the governors were forced to intervene in the interests of public order, and usually, with a fine Roman arbitrariness, punished in the interest of peace the first visible cause, however innocent. But it was not alone the sensuous, soft life of the mob that Christianity threatened; the new religion was a constantly increasing peril for the old ethnic state based upon a vast and intricate system of idolatry, on which it had grown to universal supremacy, and for which it felt that clinging sympathy which exists between institutions that have grown up on the same soil, under the same influences and with the same scope. Between that state and Christianity there could be no alliance, and the lawyer's mind of Tertullian saw deeper into the true position than that of the scholarly apologist Melito.² So it came about in the third century that those in whom the true Roman consciousness was liveliest, and who clung with the most idolatrous passion to the invincible and eternal Majesty of the City, were firmly persuaded that the progress of the Christian idea meant the surrender of the old urban supremacy and the abdication of her secular glories before a mean and nameless multitude, obedient in every city to irresponsible heads, and actuated by ideals utterly strange, if not directly hostile to the ends of the Roman state. This ever-growing mass had in all large centres an *episcopus* and an *ecclesia*,

¹ "The divine martyrs throughout the world . . . were dealt with no longer by common law, but attacked like enemies of war."—Eus. H. E., viii., 10.

² Sed et Caesares credidissent Christo si, aut Caesares non essent necessarii saeculo, aut si et *Christiani potuissent esse Caesares*, *Apologeticum*, c. 21. Compare the vague fear of Celsus that the Christians will ruin the state, *Origen adv. Celsum*, viii., 68, and Athenagoras, *Legatio*, ii., 3.

and avoided the *capitolium* and the *fora*. It held, with a strange unanimity, doctrines most unintelligible to the Roman statesmen. Its teachings concerning the poor, celibacy, woman and slavery, affected the existing framework of society at a hundred points. The profound ineradicable devotion to their chiefs, whether dead or alive, excited the sombre jealousy of the emperor, who claimed for the Roman Majesty, in him incorporate, all the devotion and sympathy of every citizen.

Frequent invasion, successful insurrection, blighting pests, and rapid internal decay, added to the gravity of the situation, and we need not wonder that, in such a frame of mind, an otherwise good emperor like Decius, blind in his devotion to the tottering state, and urged on by the jealous philosophers and the interested temple-priesthoods, undertook the eradication of the hated sect. But he came too late to the task. The *pusillus grex* had been shielded for over two centuries from a systematic onslaught that, humanly speaking, might have utterly scattered it at an earlier date and Decius died, confessing that the cosmopolitan Christian association, with its centre beneath the shadow of the Palatine, was a graver danger to the empire than any change of dynasty.¹ Henceforward, Christianity is, in a sense, on a political level with the empire. In the long series of irregular successions and counter-revolutions that fill the period subsequent to the brave death of Decius, the only united body in the empire seems to be the Christians, and their influence is felt and accepted in opposing camps, in the stress of public misfortune, and even at the tribunal of Cæsar. Henceforth they fill the armies, and the highest offices of the empire are entrusted to them. They are in the councils of the Illyrian emperors, and the conversion of Cæsar is no longer looked on as impossible or improbable. The females of the imperial court are won over to a religion, of all others the most sympathetic and favorable to their sex. The very camps are redolent with an atmosphere of Christianity, and it is already in possession of the highest fruits of a perfect society among men—varied literature, native art and architecture, written legislation, representative assemblies, domestic annals, and an enlightened public opinion based on the ancient traditions and the historic evolution of the Christian world.²

It is at this period of transition, in the lull that follows the events of A. D. 250–251, and before the outbreak of the final hur-

¹ Cum multo patientius et tolerabilius audiret levare adversus se æmulum principem quam constitui Romæ Dei Sacerdotem. St. Cyprian, Ep. 55, 9 (ed. Hartel) p. 630).

² De Broglie, *L'Eglise et L'Etat au IV^{ème} siècle*, 6 vols., Paris, 1860–66, vol. i., c. i. Mason, *The Persecution of Diocletian*, Cambridge, 1876. Burckhardt, *Die Zeit Constantins* (2d ed.), Leipzig, 1880.

ricane, that we desire to sketch the Christian society, its numbers, the causes of its rapid progress, its system of government, its bonds of unity, and its external life and action.

No domain of history has been scrutinized by more sharp eyes, or has been subjected to more diverse appreciations. No field of historical research counts to-day more patient, well-equipped scholars. For these reasons a summary retrospect of the true condition of Christianity at this time may interest the general reader, and awaken in him fresh sympathy for those great men who upbore its banner in the darkest hour of conflict, confiding only on the justice of their cause and the right arm of the Almighty—we mean the Dionysii, the Cornelii, the Sixti, the Cyprians, the Lucii, the Eusebii, the Fabiani, and however else may have been called the leaders of that glorious militia which lifted the walls of Sion amid the smoking carnage of battle and the horrid din of infernal opposition.

I.

(a) In the West.

The Number of the Christians.—The rapid spread of Christianity in the West is evident from the testimony of Tacitus, who speaks of a *multitudo ingens* as existing at Rome in the time of Nero.¹ It was thence that the faith was carried, at uncertain epochs of the first or second centuries, to Gaul, Africa, Spain, Britain, and the islands of the Mediterranean. The language of Tertullian, in his apologetic writings,² though somewhat rhetorical, must yet be substantially reliable, and his statement concerning the *Britannorum inaccessa Romanis loca Christo vero subdita*, is borne out by the well-known phrase of St. Irenæus anent the barbarian nations who had the law written in their hearts without ink or paper.³

We have no means of calculating exactly the proportion of the Western Christians to the pagan population at the close of the third century. The number of bishops would afford some clew if

¹ Igitur primo correpti qui fatebantur, deinde indicio eorum multitudo ingens, haud perinde crimine incendii quam odio humani generis convicti sunt, *Annales* xv., 44.

² Obsessam vociferantur civitatem : in agris, in castellis, in insulis Christianos ; omnem sexum, ætatem, conditionem, etiam dignitatem transgredi ad hoc nomen quasi detrimento maerent. *Apologeticum*, c. i. Hesterni sumus et vestra omnia implevimus, urbes, insulas, castella, municipia, castra ipsa, tribus, decurias, palatium, senatum, forum : sola vobis relinquimus templa, c. 37.

³ Cui ordinationi assentiunt multæ gentes barbarorum, eorum qui in Chri tum credunt, sine charta et atramento scriptam habentes per spiritum in cordibus salutem, et veterem traditionem custodientes, *Adv. haer.*, iii., 4, 2. Taking these words together with the reference of Tertullian to British Christians, it seems to us that there is much more than modern critics allow in the story of the conversion of the British king (chieftain ?) Lucius in the latter half of the second century. See *Liber Pontificalis* (ed. Duchesne), vol i., pp. cii. 59, 136, and the articles "LUCIUS" and "ELEUTHERIUS," in Smith's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*.

it were known. The Acts of the pseudo Synod of Sinuessa, compiled toward the end of the fifth century, relate that in the year 303 there were three hundred Italian bishops gathered near that city to condemn the Roman bishop Marcellinus for his supposed fall.¹ If these acts represented any local traditions, the above number would indicate a large Christian population in Italy at this time. We have yet the episcopal lists of the Councils of Arles (314) and Nice (325), but in faulty condition. While the number of bishops present at the latter is usually put down at 318, the ancient authorities variously estimate the number at Arles from 33, surely too small for a synod called by St. Augustine *plenarium universæ ecclesiæ concilium*, to 600, too great a number for the united churches of Italy, Gaul, and Africa, to furnish at that time. About the year 250, the Roman Church counted nearly one hundred and fifty clerics, and supported from common funds fifteen hundred widows and orphans.² We learn from Eusebius, that at a Roman synod, in 251, there were present sixty bishops, and many more priests and deacons, while a Carthaginian synod of the same year, was visited by "very many bishops." St. Cyprian likewise informs us that, several years earlier a Numidian synod held in the *Lam-besitana Colonia* counted ninety bishops among its members.³

The Roman Synod, of 313, in the affair of Donatus, counted among the judges fifteen Italian bishops, and three from Gaul, while Cæcilius and Donatus brought each ten African bishops with him.⁴ We may imagine that these bishops did not represent any small or insignificant places, since as early as 343, the sixth canon of the council of Sardica forbade, as an abuse, the location of bishops in small sees, *ne vilescat nomen episcopi et auctoritas*. The *Liber Pontificalis* mentions forty-six episcopal ordinations at Rome, during six and a half years, in the very troublous and interrupted pontificates of Marcellus, Eusebius, and Miltiades.

The latter figures argue a very large Christian population at Rome before the persecutions of Diocletian began. Eusebius even tells us that Maxentius stopped the persecutions to please the people, and his famous words in the eighth book of his history on the extraordinary increase of the Christians must be taken to include the city of Rome, which had ever been the chief centre of Christian interests.⁵

A very large part of the Roman lower classes at this time may have been Christians, as they were able to fill the city with sedi-

¹ Hefele, *History of the Councils*, i., 143. Mansi, *Coll. Amplissima Conc.*, i., 1250.

² Eusebius, *Hist. Ecc.*, vi., 43. Letter of Cornelius of Rome to Fabius of Antioch.

³ Euseb., *ibid.* Cyprian, ep. 59 (ed. Hartel).

⁴ Optatus, *De Schismate Donatist*, lib. i.

⁵ H. E. viii., cc. i, 14.

tion and uproar because of internal dissensions and disputed papal elections.¹ The inscriptions of the catacombs justify the inference that many of the middle classes had accepted the teachings of Christ, though but few of the Roman aristocracy had openly professed the faith. At the beginning of the fourth century the Roman Church had twenty-five titles or quasi-parishes for the purposes of baptism and penance, and some twenty cemeteries for the burial of the dead.² All this argues a large Christian element, and we cannot be far wrong in putting down the contemporary Christians of Rome at about one hundred thousand in a population variously estimated from eight hundred thousand to a million and a half.

There were certainly as many more in the rest of Italy. At this period Africa had about two hundred bishops,³ and though the bishoprics of Spain were fewer, there was perhaps the same proportion of Christians in each province—about one hundred thousand, if we take the small scale of five hundred souls for each bishop of Africa. In Africa, the rapid spread of the Donatist heresy proves the great number of Christians early in the fourth century. In 330, the Donatists had two hundred and seventy bishops at a synod, *i.e.*, one for every Catholic diocese. The Spanish synod of Elvira (about 300) speaks as though Christians were to be found in every walk of life. There is in its utterances a consciousness of long-established authority. It speaks of the *copia puellarum* among the Christians, and the danger of marrying outside the faith. The insistence on the frequentation of the Mass might indicate a great increase in numbers, and consequent lukewarmness on the part of the faithful.⁴

The number of Christians in Gaul cannot have been very great at this time, and they were perhaps confined chiefly to the valley of the Rhone, the southern sea-coast, and the Roman stations on the Rhine. Sulpicius Severus, himself a Gallo Roman, tells us that Christianity was slow in penetrating into Gaul. "*Religione Dei scrius trans Alpes suscepta.*" The similar testimony of Gregory of Tours is borne out by the inscriptions and the study of the ancient episcopal lists of Gaul.⁵ There were bishops of Treves and Cologne

¹ In the famous case of the disputed election between Eusebius and Heraclius, the epitaph of St. Eusebius, recovered by De Rossi, tells us: "Hinc furor, hinc odium sequitur, discordia, lites, seditio, cædes, solvuntur foedera pacis," etc. See Northcote and Brownlow, *Roma Sotteranea*, I., p. 343.

² *Liber Pontificalis* (ed. Duchesne), i., 164. "Hic (Marcellus) XXV. titulos in urbe Roma constituit, quasi dioeceses, propter baptismum et poenitentiam multorum qui convertebantur ex paganis, et propter sepulturas martyrum."

³ Münster, *Primordia Ecclesiæ Africanae*. Hafniæ, 1829, p. 24.

⁴ Hefele, I., 145. In the *Mélanges Renier* the Abbé Duchesne has shown that this important synod was held about the year 300.

⁵ See Duchesne, *Mémoire sur l'origine des diocèses épiscopaux en Gaule*, Paris, 1890.

at Arles (314), as well as three bishops from Britain, but a half-century later, the latter country had only three at the synod of Rimini (359). We hear of persecutions under Diocletian at St. Albans and Caerleon in Britain, but the scanty references to them do not justify us in supposing a considerable Christian population.

The Apostolic Churches of Greece and Macedonia seem to have held their own during the third century. We do not hear of any notable increase, but this may be owing to the gradual disappearance of Greek influences from Roman public life, as well as to the stubborn resistance of Hellenism on its own natal soil. It was only in the ninth century that paganism was eventually extirpated in the remote parts of the Peloponnesus.¹ The churches of Corinth and Byzantium were flourishing at the end of the second century, and Christianity had already been well established in many of the islands, as in Crete and Melos.

(b) *In the Orient.*

The diffusion of Christianity was naturally much greater in the Orient. It was long looked on as an eastern cult, scarcely distinguishable from Judaism. Its professors were usually from the east, where its first communities were established, and where it acquired its distinctive name. In the west the barbarian lands were an almost impassable barrier, but the entire east was the seat of ancient culture and refinement—precisely the field for a religion which appealed to all the higher and purer instincts of humanity. A letter of Pliny to Trajan early in the second century shows what astonishing progress the new religion had made in Bithynia and Pontus, and casts a strong light on the missions of Paul and Barnabas in Asia Minor.² Fifty years later, the magician, Alexander of Abonuteichos, found the same provinces full of atheists and Christians, and in the Easter controversy several bishops of this region took a notable part. In the latter half of the third century Gregory Thaumaturgus is said to have almost entirely converted the pagan population in certain parts of Pontus, and his *Epistola Canonica*, one of the earliest and most venerable documents of diocesan legislation, supposes many well established Christian communities. We learn from Philostorgius³ that at this time the Goths captured many Christian ecclesiastics on the occasion of their inroads into Cappadocia and Galatia.

¹ Constantine Porphyrogen. *De Adm. regni*, c. 50. For the details of the gradual extirpation of paganism after Constantine, see Schultze, *Der Untergang des Heidentums*. Jena, 1892.

² Pliny, *Epp.*, Lib. X., 93.

³ Lucian, *Pseudomantis*, c. 25.

⁴ Philostorgius, H. E., ii., 15. Routh, *Reliquiæ Sacræ*, iii., p. 256.

The cities of the western seaboard of Asia Minor, Ephesus, Smyrna, Tralles, Sardes, Rhodes and others, contained a very large Christian population. Already, in the middle of the third century the city of Apamæa in Phrygia¹ was thoroughly Christian, and used a Christian seal. The Acts of St. Pionius of Smyrna (middle of third century) reveal a city largely Christian, in which prejudice had nearly died out. The Apostolic activity of St. John, St. Paul, and of St. Timothy; the multitude of Jews who dwelt in these towns; the peculiar susceptibility to Christian influence of the numerous Greek artists who inhabited this region, contributed greatly to the increase of the Christians.

In the first three centuries we learn the names of only about thirty episcopal sees in this quarter; but that they were much more numerous is evident from the fact that about one hundred bishops of Asia Minor took part at the Council of Nice (325). It would scarcely be an exaggeration to say that one-tenth of the twenty millions of Asia Minor were Christians at the beginning of the persecution of Diocletian.

The Christian population of Syria must have been proportionately as large as that of Asia Minor. It was the first land into which the Jewish proselytes penetrated; its cities, notably Damascus and Antioch, were filled with Jews. Here, too, a very large share of the early Christian literature arose. The early Syriac translation of the sacred books of the Christians (the Peschito), the compilation of such episcopal manuals as the Apostolic Constitution, and such romances as the Recognitions of Clement, the tireless activity of Pamphilus and his school of transcribers in copying the Scriptures—prove that there were many communities of wealthy and intelligent Christians. From the end of the first century Antioch was recognized by them as the head of all the churches of Syria, a position to which her size, situation and history fully entitled her. Syria was the highway of Christian missionaries going east or west or north, and the number of its seaports made it an excellent field for proselytism; on the other hand the coarse and sensuous character of its idolatry furnished the

¹ "Thenceforward (from A.D. 112) for three hundred years Phrygia was essentially a Christian land. There began the public profession of Christianity; there are found, from the third century, on monuments exposed to the public gaze, the terms *Chrestianos* or *Christianos*; there the formulas of epitaphs convey veiled references to Christian dogmas; there, from the days of Septimius Severus, great cities adopt biblical symbols for their coins, or rather adapt their old traditions to biblical narrations. A great number of the Christians of Ephesus and Rome came from Phrygia. The names most frequently met with on the monuments of Phrygia are the antique Christian names (Trophimus, Tychicus, Tryphenus, Papias, etc.), the names special to the apostolic times and of which the martyrologies are full."—Renan, *Origines du Christianisme*, iii, pp. 363-364.

Christians the most tangible of arguments in favor of monotheism. The discoveries of M. De Vogüe in Northern and Central Syria have put it beyond a doubt that at the beginning of the fourth century there was a very large percentage of Christians of rank and wealth in the splendid capital of the Orient.¹ The small kingdoms of Osroene, Adiabene and Edessa were in great measure Christian at the end of the second century. In fact the first national conversion to Christianity that we know was that of the Abgars of Edessa, a line of kings whose Jewish sympathies go back more than a century earlier.²

The entire population of Palestine was much reduced in the early imperial period, and perhaps it did not amount to more than six hundred and fifty thousand. Among them there existed yet, and for many years after, the small church of the Nazarene Christians.³ But the vast majority belonged to the Universal Church. The Jews preserved for a long time a peculiar autonomy, especially on their native soil. The Rabbinical schools nurtured the vague hope of a glorious temporal Messiah, and their patriarchs were clothed with a mixed temporal and spiritual power, which was so great in the time of Origen that the Jews pointed to it to show that the sceptre had not yet passed from Judah.⁴ Still, from the beginning of the third century we notice that there is a kind of renaissance in Christian proselytism. The death of the Bishop Narcissus removed a venerable but aged administrator. Alexander, a Greek, who had come on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, succeeded him. He seems to have been a man of great literary activity, and the earliest public library of Christendom was his creation. There is reason to believe that from this time many pilgrims came yearly to Jerusalem, which some ancient Christians looked on as the centre of the earth. Their number may have been one of the reasons why the city arose about this time, even before the victory of Constantine, to a greater influence than it had enjoyed as a colony of Hadrian.⁵

The frequent and bloody persecutions of the Alexandrine Christians are clear evidence that they were numerous. The cosmopolitan character of the city, the Paris of antiquity, with its multitudinous traders and travellers from Britain to India, furthered the

¹ De Vogüe. *La Syrie Centrale, Architecture civile et religieuse, du I. au VII. siècle.* Paris, 1865.

² *Chronicon Edessenum* in the *Bibliotheca Orientalis* of Assemani. For the many interesting questions connected with the origin of Christianity in these regions, see Tixeront, *Les Origines de l'Eglise d'Edesse*, Paris, 1888.

³ St. Jerome, Ep. 74 (89) ad Augustinum.

⁴ See Schuerer, *History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, vol. i., part ii., p. 276.

⁵ Euseb., *Hist. Ecc.*, vi., 8, 20; vi., 14, 19, 32.

Christian proselytism in a city of philosophers, students and inquirers. We find here, from the latter half of the second century, a kind of Christian university, the famous catechetical school, which drew many pagans to its lectures. The history of the Arian heresy in its incipient stage shows a very large body of Christians at Alexandria early in the fourth century, where, at the same time, we hear of parishes (as at Rome), of hundreds of consecrated virgins, and similar indications of a flourishing community. The Egypto-Meletian schism is proof that the Coptic church was widespread throughout the Delta and along the Nile, and the same conviction results from the reading of the acts of the Coptic martyrs.

Early in the fourth century Alexander, of Alexandria, was able to gather a hundred bishops in the preliminary synod that condemned the teachings of Arius. Altogether it has been calculated that Egypt contained, in the time of Diocletian, about the same percentage of Christians as Asia Minor, *i.e.*, about one million, or the eighth part of the population. In this may rightly be included the long strip of Libyan territory and the Pentapolis. Ancient Christian catacombs have been discovered in the territory of Cyrenaica, which betray the presence of numerous Christians.¹

Beyond the limits of the empire, Armenia, the first of the great kingdoms to accept Christianity as the religion of the state, was thoroughly Christian before the victory of Saxa Rubra (A.D. 312). The work of Gregory the Illuminator was then going on over the whole plateau of this vast border-land, where Roman and Parthian, Byzantine and Persian, fought so long and so fiercely for absolute dominion. Its sparse population of three millions lived in somewhat feudal relations with the great nobles and the king. The aristocracy must have become Christian at the same time, since we learn from Eusebius that Maximinus Daza made war against Armenia (312) for having embraced Christianity, and an ancient tradition says that Gregory ordained four hundred bishops before his death.²

Persia is the country to which the apocryphal but very ancient Acts of the Apostles Simon and Jude, Thomas and Matthew,

¹ Eusebius (H. E., viii., 8) speaks of "multitudes of Christian martyrs" in Egypt during the last persecution. One group condemned to the copper-mines of Palestine included seventy, and another one hundred and thirty men. The language and conduct of Dionysius of Alexandria, in the previous generation, show a very large Christian population, not only at Alexandria, but throughout the Delta of the Nile. On the catacombs of Egypt and Cyrenaica, see Kraus, *Real-Encyclopædie*, ii., 136.

² Agathangelos and Moses of Khorene (Langlois, *Historiens de l'Arménie*, Paris, 1867.) See also *Acta SS* Sept. viii., 295-413, and Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, vol. i. Eusebius (H. E., ix., 8) speaks of the whole Armenian people as being "Christians, and zealous in their piety toward the Deity."

point as "the dark and bloody ground" of their apostolate. The Jews were there in larger numbers than elsewhere in the world outside of Judæa.¹ The border-lands of Mesopotamia and the small Syro-Greek kingdoms were filled with Christian communities, and Greek and Roman influences prevailed largely at the court of the last kings of the Parthian dynasty.² The great persecution begun by the new national dynasty of the Persians under Schapur (Sapor) II. reveals a sense of fear on the part of the Magians, and the number of the martyrs, variously calculated from sixteen to one hundred and ninety thousand, shows how the Christian faith had already honey-combed the Zoroastrian cult. John, a bishop of the Persian Church, assisted at the Council of Nice, and some years later the Persian Christians were numerous enough to induce Constantine to intercede for them with Schapur.³

In antiquity the limits of the territory known as Arabia were only vaguely known, and the success of the Roman arms was never complete enough to warrant the establishment of colonies. The nomadic manners of the Arabs or Saracens, and the fanatic Jewries on the border, were great obstacles to the spread of the Christian religion, yet we find about the middle of the third century "very many bishops" assembled at Bostra, a fortified Roman camp on the plateau of the Hauran, to try the case of the bishop Beryllus in presence of Origen. A Roman general, stationed in this neighborhood, sought the instruction of that great Christian teacher, as did Julia Mammæa, the mother of Alexander Severus. Finally, a contemporary Roman Emperor, Philip the Arab, came from the vicinity of Bostra, and we know by the testimony of Eusebius that he was commonly reputed a Christian. The doctrines of Judaism had long since made some progress among the tribes of the desert, as we learn from Sozomen, and they were the usual leverage for Christian proselytism. That the monks and ascetics who fled to these remote regions made deep impressions on the children of the desert, is evidenced by the strange story of Queen Mania and the solitary Moses.

Isolated Christian captives there were among the Saracens, as among the Goths, in the middle of the third century. Eusebius relates the tender charity and concern of the Roman See in

¹ The statistics of the Jewish Diaspora in the early imperial period are collected in the above-cited work of Schuerer. On the apostolic missions in Persia, see Lipsius, *Die Apokryphen Apostelgeschichten*, 4 vols.

² The origins of these national churches in the border lands of Rome and Persia are ably discussed in the above-cited work of Tixeront, and the polemic reply of the Abbé Martin.

³ See Hefele, *History of the Councils*, vol. i., and Tillemont, *Mem. p. servir à l'hist. ecclésiast. que*, vii., 76.

regard to these unfortunates.¹ It is very probable that there were communities of Christians in the Malabar peninsula before the time of Constantine, and the history and teachings of Manes reveal the presence of Christianity on the outermost limits of Persia.²

Trade and war, travel and lettered curiosity, must have scattered a sporadic knowledge of its tenets in every part of the world which was in any way known to the peoples of Greco-Roman culture. It is literally true that *in omnem terram exivit sonus eorum*. The pages of Eusebius are full of the conviction that Christianity had already become numerically a huge power on the earth, with which henceforth all rulers must count. He quotes for us the Edict of Maximinus Daza in which he admits that "nearly all men" had deserted the service of the gods (H. E. ix., 9). He tells us of the incredible increase of Christianity in the days immediately preceding the persecution of Diocletian. He paints the public rejoicings in every city at the release of the martyrs and the great activity in church-building and works of benevolence consequent on the cessation of the persecution.³ It is impossible to read these pages and not feel that what the genius of Melito of Sardes and Origen had foreseen, was now come to pass:⁴ the empire had become Christian, in this sense, that the religion of Christ now stood out the only compact, united, vigorous and aggressive religious power in the empire. It had not yet the majority. The religious philosophies and the ethnic cults lasted on, but without hope, or cohesion, or balance, or distinct aim. The battle was won, and the division of the spoils might be left till the morrow.⁵

¹ Euseb., H. E., vi., 33, 21, 34. Sozomen, Hist. Ecc., vi., 38. "Why need I speak of the multitude that wandered in the deserts and mountains (of Arabia), and perished by hunger, and thirst, and cold, and sickness, and robbers, and wild beasts?" *Dionysius of Alexandria*, in Euseb., H. E., vi., 42. The Roman Church redeemed many of these unfortunates from the captivity of the Saracens, Euseb., vii., 5.

² See "The Christians of St. Thomas," in *The Catholic Times* of Philadelphia, April 15, 1893, and the articles on MANES and MANICHÆANS, in Smith's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*.

³ "How can any one describe those vast assemblies, and the multitude that crowded together in every city, and the famous gatherings in the house of prayer, on whose account, not being satisfied with the ancient buildings, they erected from the foundations large churches in all the cities."—Euseb., H. E., viii., 1.

⁴ Melito boldly parallels the rapid spread of Christianity with the contemporary growth of the Roman name and power, and insinuates that they are related as cause and effect, Euseb., H. E., iv., 26; Otto, *Corpus Apologetarum*, ix., p. 412. The number and influence of the Christians in the Orient might easily justify the vague conviction of Origen that the religion of Christians would one day be mistress of the empire, "since it was daily winning a multitude of souls," *Adv. Celsum*, viii., 68 (Migne, P. G., xi., 1620.) On the character and opinions of this very remarkable bishop of the second century, see *Melito von Sardes*, by C. Thomas, Osnabreck, 1893.

⁵ The details of the gradual extirpation of Paganism are given in the rare and

From the above or similar data, Gibbon reckons the Christian population of the empire before the conversion of Constantine at about five millions or one twentieth of the population; Keim, Zöckler and Chastel at about sixteen millions, while Schultze puts ten millions as the minimum figure in a population of about one hundred millions.¹ The Christians were surely more numerous than the Jews who numbered some four millions within the empire at this period; hence the figures of Gibbon must be looked on as too low, especially as the Orient alone would easily furnish, from modern calculations, a greater number.

(c) *Constituents of the Christian Society.*

The Christian society of the third century was made up of many elements. No doubt, the poor and the humble were in a great majority. But it would be as much of an error to think that slaves were very numerous in it, as to imagine that any large portion of the Roman aristocracy had accepted the teachings of Christ. The legal position of the former made it difficult and dangerous to practice a religion which their masters did not approve, and the public duties and ambitions of the latter found in Christianity a most embarrassing obstacle. In the higher classes, especially, the neglect of the Roman religion was less easily tolerated than in the motley multitude.

The bulk of the Christian population seems usually to have been made up of the middle classes—the free poor, the small tradesman or patron, artisans, workers in metal and marble, Greek and Oriental foreigners,² etc.

costly work of Beugnot, *Histoire de la Destruction du Paganisme en Occident*, Paris, 1835, and Chastel, *Histoire de la Destruction du Paganisme dans l'Empire d'Orient*, Paris, 1850. The works of M. Boissier, *La Fin du Paganisme*, Paris, 1891, and V. Schultze, *Der Untergang des griechisch-romischen Heidentums*, Jena, 1887, are written from different view-points, but are both valuable.

¹ Schultze, op. cit., i., p. 22.

² See Allard, *Les Esclaves Chrétiens*, Paris, 1876. It is the impression which the Acts of the Martyrs, e.g., those of St. Justin, and the complexion of the Roman Church before Constantine make upon us. The Acts of St. Pionius of Smyrna show a large and free Christian population in that city about A.D. 250. And the wealth of the Roman Church came neither from slaves nor entirely from her noble members. On the percentage of the nobility in the primitive Church see the Bulletins of De Rossi, s.v. NOBILITAS, the work of Dom Guéranger, *Sainte Cécile et la Société Romaine aux deux premiers siècles* (3d ed.), Paris, 1890, and Lanciani, *Pagan and Christian Rome*. The Kings of Edessa were Christian from the end of the second century at least. Those of Armenia were converted a century later, and in the meantime the little Greek state of the Bosphorus (Crimea) had become largely Christian. It was commonly believed that the Emperor Philip the Arab and his family, were Christian, and such too, seem to have been Julia Mamaea, the distinguished mother of Alexander Severus, and Salonina the wife of Gallienus. The wife and daughter of Diocletian were Christians before the outbreak of the persecution. When "Cæsar's

There was a great deal of travel in the early imperial epoch,¹ and every large church counted on its feast-days men of many nationalities within its walls. At Alexandria and Antioch, at Nicomedia and Trier the great offices of state were frequently filled by Christians. They had a splendid church at Nicomedia, built upon an elevation, and the Old Basilica at Antioch was not without a certain magnificence. St. Optatus of Milevi informs us that early in the fourth century they had over forty churches at Rome, and Eusebius tells us that before the last persecution there was a very great activity in church-building throughout the empire. The churches began already to possess the cemeteries in their own right, and they formed corporations, capable of holding property from the time of Gallienus. The little "house churches" had long since given way to a peculiarly Christian style, for the basilica form was not first adopted by the Christians after the downfall of paganism—it is considerably older, and some maintain that it is the product of Christian architectural progress in the third century, the outcome of a combination of "house-church," catacomb-chapel, and private domestic hall.² Yet, while it is clear that Christianity was very widespread in the last quarter of the third century, we must make due reservations; it was met with chiefly in the cities, much less in the open country; its votaries were far more numerous in the East than in the West; their public status was in a transition crisis from the primitive period when the powerful and contemptuous state scarcely distinguished them from the mob of Jews to the hour when the terrified administration recognized that the whole world was honeycombed with the new doctrines and the hour of final conflict was at hand. The latter point is very clear from the history of Paul of Samosata, and the opening reflections of Eusebius in the eighth book of his Church History, as well as from the Epitaph of Pope Eusebius and certain remarks of St. Cyprian in the golden booklet *De Lapsis*.

II.

*Causes of the Rapid Spread of Christianity*³—(a) *Froselytism*.—The words of Christ (Luke iv., 18, 19; ix., 2) could leave no doubt in the minds of the Apostles as to the chief means by which

household" did not escape, we need not wonder that many Caecilii, Valerii, Anicii, Glabrones, Annii, Probi, Bassi, Graecini and like families were won over to Christianity.

¹ See *Weltverkehr und Kirche in den drei ersten Jahrhunderten*, by Theo. Zahn, Hanover, 1877.

² See the article on BASILICAS in the *Encyclopædia* of Kraus.

³ The writer takes for granted the co-operation of supernatural agencies, and the impossibility of explaining by natural causes alone the long and successful resistance, and the ultimate survival of Christianity.

they were to found the kingdom of God in the hearts of men. It was by oral preaching, by personal appeal and instruction. They understood from the beginning that they were above all "ministers and captains" of the Word (Acts v., 12). The earliest Christian writers present the *εὐαγγέλιον*, the *κήρυγμα*, the public official proclamation of the history and the teachings of Jesus Christ as the ordinary means of propagating faith in Him. The earliest bits of Christian biography, the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles, are usually styled preachings or circuits, and in the Christian literature of the first three centuries the inculcation of Christianity is called a teaching, a bearing of witness.¹ In the days of the first vivid enthusiasm the Christians saw many quasi inspired men, called prophets, who wandered up and down the world, filled with a holy zeal, discoursing with more than human eloquence, often rapt beyond themselves, omnipresent, tireless, aggressive, well fitted to introduce the heaven of truth into a timorous or hesitating community, and to confirm in the accepted faith the dubious and wavering. The generation of these ardent souls did not pass away with the apostolic times; they lived on into the second century. There are echoes of their missions in Papias, Polycarp, Ignatius and Hermas. "The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" shows them yet active in the service of the Catholic Church,² and a valuable passage of Eusebius leads us to believe that they were still numerous in the middle of the second Christian century.³ The Apostles left, indeed, a regularly constituted hierarchy,⁴ but in the pioneer days of Christianity every convert was a preacher, devoured with the desire of compelling all men to enter the Kingdom of God ere the fatal hour of the Second Coming of the Son of Man.⁵

¹ Mark xvi., 15; II. Tim., iv., 17; Titus, i., 3. The Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles are collected and examined in the great work of Lipsius, *Die Apokryphen Apostelgeschichten*.

² See Funk *Opera Patrum Apostolicorum*, 2 vols., 8vo. Tuebingen, 1881.

³ "For, indeed, most of the disciples of that time, animated by the divine word with a more ardent love for philosophy (*i.e.*, the perfect Christian life), had already fulfilled the commands of the Saviour and had distributed their goods to the needy. Then starting out upon long journeys, they performed the office of evangelists, being filled with the desire to preach Christ to those that had not yet heard the word of faith, and to deliver to them the divine gospels. And when they had only laid the foundations of the faith in foreign places, they appointed others as pastors, and entrusted them with the nurture of those that had recently been brought in, while they themselves went on again to other countries and nations with the grace and co-operation of God. For a great many wonderful works were done by them through the power of the divine Spirit, so that at the first hearing whole multitudes of men eagerly embraced the religion of the Creator of the Universe."—Euseb., H. E., vii., 38.

⁴ Epistle of St. Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, c. 42, and the Epistles of St. Ignatius of Antioch. Cf. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, London, 1890.

⁵ This is well expressed by St. Hilary of Poitiers: "Ut cresceret plebs et multiplicaretur, omnibus inter initia concessum et evangelizare et baptizare . . . at ubi omnia loca circumplexa est ecclesia, conventicula constituta sunt, et rectores, et cætera officia in ecclesia sunt ordinata. Comm. in Ephes. 4.

The duty of preaching rested chiefly upon the bishop,¹ and the pages of Eusebius show us that in the second and third centuries they were men of great eloquence and address, and extremely active in disseminating the Christian teachings. The Catholic Church counts to-day among her brightest glories such pioneer preachers and administrators of the divine *mandatum* as Clement of Rome, Ignatius of Antioch, Melito of Sardes, Abircius Marcellus, Dionysius of Corinth and his namesake of Alexandria, Alexander of Jerusalem, Theophilus of Antioch, Apollinarius of Hierapolis, the Roman bishops Victor, Cornelius, Dionysius, and a host of others whose names and missionary work Eusebius either ignored or did not see fit to hand down. We see in Saint Justin a second century type of the Christian proselytizer, clothed in the coarse cloak of the philosopher, holding open school in the upper rooms of a friend's house, disputing with Cynics and Jews in the streets of Rome or the porticos of Ephesus—bland, insinuating, supple in argument, broken to all the dialectic exercise of the time, conciliating and adapting, explaining with fullest freedom the most holy *arcana* of the society, at once Jew, Greek and Roman, that he might gain all to Christ.² Not only the bishops, but the priests and deacons, had a special mission to teach and instruct, to guide the catechumens, to console the confessors and prepare them for martyrdom, to collect their last words, describe the scenes of their holy deaths, and form in the faith of Christ the new converts that every execution led into the church.³

Perhaps there is in all ecclesiastical history no more striking example of proselyting zeal than the great Origen. From his youth he burned to spread the law of Christ, and took up the public catechetical schools of Alexandria when they stood in grave peril of suppression or decay. He formed in this earliest of Christian seminaries the greatest Christians of the age; he attracted multitudes of pagans; by word and example he stirred up the sluggish depths of men's natures, and revealed to the astonished gaze of Christians and pagans the endless adaptability of the new religion to the most manifold relations of society, literature, civil government and human progress. He travelled many a weary mile across the sands of Arabia to convert a Roman general, and crossed the sea to expound Christianity to Julia Mammæa, the empress mother of the most noble and sympathetic of the pagan line of emperors. His predecessor, Pantaenus, had gone on a

¹ *Recognitions of Clement*, iii., 67. *Apostolic Constitutions*, ii., 26.

² Acts of the Martyrdom of St. Justin and his companions. Ruinart, *Acta Martyrum Sincera* (ed. Ratisbon 1859), p. 105. See his Apology and Dialogue with Trypho in Otto, *Corpus Apologetarum* (vols. i.-ii.).

³ Cruciate, torquete, damnate, atterite nos . . . Pluries efficimur quoties metimur a vobis. Semen est sanguis martyrum, Tertullian, *Apologeticum*, c. 5.

similar mission to India; in fact, the school of Alexandria was a centre of the most intelligent proselytism up to the time of Constantine. We could not ask for any better proof of it than the famous letter of Bishop Theonas of Alexandria to Lucian the Christian provost of the imperial chamberlains of Diocletian.¹

But it was not only the church authorities who carried on the proselytism for Christ. All the faithful were soldiers of the Lord, and their life was looked on as a *militia*—an existence of defensive and offensive warfare.² The most frequent scene of these holy combats was the family. The influence of a converted mother or sister was enormous. The change in the female conduct, the suavity and devotion of their lives, the increasing tenderness and pity in their dealings with the slave, the poor and the unfortunate, the moral elevation and refinement of their whole being could not escape the notice of the other members of the family circle. We may gather from the pages of Tacitus the impression that the conversion of a woman like Pomponia Græcia made on Roman society.³ That of Priscilla, Lucina, Cæcilia, the Flaviæ Domitillæ and the Aciliæ Glabrones could scarcely do less.

Yet, not unfrequently, the most bitter opposition came precisely from the family of the convert; it was so in the time of Tertullian, and somewhat later, Origen classes parents among the chief persecutors of the new religion.⁴ The proselytism of the Christians is one of the chief objections that Celsus raises against the faith,

¹ See Routh, *Reliquiæ Sacrae*, iii., 439. It contains the proof that a great many of the chief officers of Diocletian's household were Christians, but its chief interest lies in the directions given for gradually turning the attention of the emperor to the Christian faith. "Ille tamen præcipuus inter vos erit et diligentissimus cui libros servandos princeps mandaverit . . . si igitur ex credentibus in Christum ad hoc ipsum officium advocari contingat, non spernat et ipse litteras seculares et gentilium ingenia, quæ principem oblectant. Laudandi oratores . . . laudandi historici . . . Interdum et divinas scripturas laudari conabitur, . . . laudabitur et interim evangelium, apostolusque (*i. e.*, St. Paul). pro divinis oraculis: insurgere poterit Christi mentio, explicabitur paulatim ejus sola divinitas: omnia hæc cum Christi adjutorio provenire possent."

² *Jesu Christo regi eterno milito*, says the martyr Marcellus to the judge. Ruinart, *Acta Sincera*, etc. Maturus is called *generosissimus pugil Christi* in the Acts of the Martyrs of Vienne, *Militia Dei* sumus, Tert., *De Oratione*, c. 19. *Exhort ad Martyres*, c. 3. Compare II. Tim., ii., 3; I. Cor. ix., 24; I. Tim., i., 18; II. Cor., x., 3.

³ Longa huic Pomponiæ aetas, et continua tristitia fuit, . . . per quadraginta annos, non cultu nisi lugubri, non animo nisi moesto egit. Idque illi, imperitante Claudio impune, mox ad gloriam vertit. *Annales*, xiii., 32. Before this she had been traduced as *superstitionis externæ rea*, and acquitted by the domestic council. This superstition was Christianity, the *exitibilis superstitio* of Tacitus (*Ann.* xiv., 44), the *superstitio nova et malefica* of Suetonius (*Nero* 16), and the *superstitio prava et immodica* of Pliny (*Epp.* x., 96).

⁴ Sed ad Christianos quod spectat, senatum Romanum, imperatores diversis temporibus, milites, populos, ipsos eorum qui crediderunt parentes, in eorum doctrinam conspirasse, *Contra Celsum*, i., 3.

and in his replies Origen manifests much pride in the persistent devotion to Christ of poor and humble people of all nations and classes. He points out that many Christians gave themselves up entirely to missionary work.¹ And when the pagan philosopher insists that they are only the refuse of the population, the apologist does not take any pains to deny it, other than to point out that the Christians are not without some wealthy and noble members, especially among the female sex.²

This domestic apostolate was greatly furthered by the Christian slaves. The Acts of the Martyrs contain numerous evidences of the religious activity of slaves, and the lives of St. Gregory Nazienzen, St. Monica and St. Paulinus of Nola, offer evidence of their devotion and authority. We know that at one period they exercised much influence in the household of Septimius Severus, that the wet-nurse of his son Caracalla was a Christian,³ and that a certain Christian, Proculus, probably a freedman, cured the emperor by the application of oil.

"Would that we could know," says M. Allard, "the secret of those domestic missions which so vexed the pagan soul of Celsus! We would stand by the loom of the weaver and hear some uncultured tongue expound the divine truths; we would see young working-girls gathered about some venerable toiler and listening to her encomia on the sweets of purity; we might even push aside the great doors of bronze, and lifting the heavy tapestries, see the child at the knee of a Christian nurse, the youth listening to his pedagogue, the master learning from the overseer of his property, the judge instructed by the martyr. What intimate confidings! What touching revelations! What sweetly-burning tears! We would see then the pure and divine side of that awful institution of slavery, of which history has shown us only the cruel and infamous reverse. One day it is a noble, rich, illustrious family that enters the Church; again, a young girl suddenly declares her intention of leading a life of virginity; on another occasion love and peace descend with the faith into a household where hitherto reigned a

¹ *Inde liquet quod Christiani, quantum in se est, curent ut quo terrarum cunque sua doctrina spargatur quo fit ut quidam id sibi negotium desumpserint, ut non solum urbes, sed etiam vicos et villas obambulant, quo alios ad pium Dei cultum adducerent.*—*Ibid.*, iii., 9.

² *Ibid.*, iii., 44, 55. In privatis ædibus videre est lanifices, sutores, fullones, imperitissimum quemque et rusticissimum coram senioribus . . . nihil audere proloqui; ubi vero seorsum nacti fuerint pueros et mulierculas aequæ ac ipsi imperitas, mira quædam disserunt, etc.—Cf. *ibid.*, i., 27, vi., 14, and *Peri Archon*, iv., 1, 2.

³ Cruel as Caracalla was, there are several reasons for believing that he was favorable to the Christians: his early education, his aversion to sacrifices, his recalling of all those banished to the islands, his vexation at the punishment of his Christian playmate, the comparative peace of the faithful during his reign.—(Cf. CARACALLA in *Dictionary of Christian Biography*.)

horrid rivalry in vice ; elsewhere a magistrate lays aside the trappings of office to live an humble and charitable life : all the while the world looks on and knows not the secret springs of such strange resolutions, but somewhere and always there is a poor slave who divides with the Lord a secret that causes his heart to overflow with heavenly gladness."¹

(b) *Corporate Union of Christians*.—In spite of the most active proselytism, the Christian religion would have made but slow progress if its members had not established some system of frequent assembly, enabling them to meet regularly for mutual edification and consolation. That they did so is amply proved by the Acts of the Martyrs, the repressive imperial legislation, the literary remains, and the venerable monuments of the pre-Constantinian period. But how was it possible for such numerous bodies of men to meet in the midst of great cities, when the very name of the Christians was outlawed? From the time of Nero, Christianity was an illicit religion. *Non licet esse vos* was the watchword of heathen society, and might have been written over the door of every meeting-place of the Christians. To the traditional Roman statesman the Christian appeared as one who violated fundamental laws of the state. He introduced a foreign superstition and a new cult without the permission of the senate or the emperor. He was guilty of high treason by refusing even the simplest act of worship to the genius of perenduring Rome. He manifested an obstinacy against the sacred state, which was absolutely incomprehensible to the magistrates, when they only asked an outward compliance, and cared little or nothing for his intimate convictions. He belonged to a forbidden society, and actions for sacrilege and the practice of criminal magic could, in the opinion of Roman lawyers, be brought against him. In a word, he lived in a time when all the civil and religious elements of society were inextricably interwoven, and a new, exclusive, proselytizing, universal religion could not help offending at every step a civil order which was at once the outgrowth and solid proof of idolatry.² It is true that there

¹ Paul Allard; *Les Esclaves Chrétiens*, p. 300. An interesting verification of the above is furnished by the sarcophagus of Proxenes in the Villa Borghese at Rome. The original decoration and the epitaph are purely pagan, but one of his Christian freedmen, absent from Rome at the time of his death, has left us the secret of his conversion in the following mutilated words which he scratched on the tomb: PROSENESE RECEPIT AD DEUM REGREDIENS IN URBE SCRIPSIT AMPELIUS LIBERTUS. De Rossi, *Inscriptiones Christianæ Urbis Romæ*, vol. i., n. 5 (an. 217), p. 9.

² The legal position of Christianity in the early imperial period is the subject of an exhaustive study by the Christian epigraphist Le Blant: *Sur les bases juridiques des poursuites dirigées contre les Martyres*, in the proceedings of the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles Lettres, vol. ii, Paris, 1868, pp. 358-373. See also the article CHRISTENVERFOLGUNGEN in Kraus' *Real-Encyclopædie*, i., p. 215. According to Lactantius (Div. Inst., v., ii.), the great jurist Ulpian went so far as to codify the numerous laws directed against the Christians in a work entitled *De officio proconsulis*.

were long periods of peace for the Christians under emperors like Commodus and Caracalla, Alexander Severus and Gallienus, and in the forty years preceding the last persecution the laws were on the statute-books, but were not enforced. Fanaticism was wearied and silent. The emperors discouraged or forbade pursuit of Christians, who, on the other hand, were becoming so numerous that nothing short of wholesale extermination could uproot the evil.

Nevertheless, there was a period especially during the second century when Christianity had not yet wearied its persecutors, and when the laws were regularly applied to work its eradication.¹ How did the vast network of Christian associations manage to exist during this latter period without being constantly broken up and forced to abandon the strong leverage which they had in their regular reunions on stated days and in fixed places? Much light has been thrown upon this question within the last half century by the researches of archæologists and illustrators of the civil law. In the ancient world scarcely any institution was dearer to the masses of the people than the right of association. While the democratic or republican spirit enlured in Greece and Rome, this natural right was held sacred, and we have a multitude of epigraphic evidences to show that there existed a vast network of societies for every imaginable purpose—trade guilds, religious sodalities, confraternities, *collegia* for every grade and avocation among the bourgeois and the poor, while the Roman patriciate found in its traditions its wealth, its business, and political franchises, the consolation and strength that the poor sought in their association or college.² It was a result of the Greek's aversion to quiet family life, that he threw himself with ardor into external associations. Long before the coming of Christ, men united at Athens, Rhodes, and on the islands for purposes of business, or pleasure, to insure against loss by fire, and to honor some particular deity. The meetings were held in some retired garden, surrounded with porticos, and provided with a central altar of sacrifice. Dignitaries chosen by lot, and an elective president carried on the government of the little state, for such it was in many cases, the members being passionately attached to this second and artificial family. There was a common treasury, and mutual benevolence played a large share in the transactions of these curious forerunners of our modern social re-

¹ Cf. Renan, *Marc-Aurèle*, pp. 53, 302, and Allard, *Hist. des persécutions pendant les deux premiers siècles*, i., 329-388.

² Mommsen, *De Collegiis et Sodaliciis Romanorum*, Kiliae, 1843. Boissier, *La Religion Romaine aux temps des Antonins*, Paris, 1884, vol. ii., p. 238, *Les Classes Inférieures et les Associations populaires*. Doucet, *Rapports de l'Église et de l'État aux trois premiers siècles*, Paris, 1883, pp. 152-164; Boissier *Promenades Archéologiques*, Paris, 1887 (*Rome et Pompéii*, p. 183.)

unions. They were a kind of harmless freemasonry, in which were preserved some of the better traits of the old Hellenic life.¹ Whether the Romans adopted these associations from the Greeks, or formed them from natural inclination, they existed in great numbers in the period immediately before and after Christ. In the earlier times they had a religious character, but became eventually, in the last days of the republic the prey of political demagogues, and were thenceforward, under the dictators and the emperors of the first two Christian centuries, the object of much repressive legislation.² They were either completely forbidden, or allowed only with the greatest difficulty.

Whereas originally every trade and industry, every god indigenous or foreign, every nation or city or great family had its special body of associates bearing its name and serving its interests, the military rulers of the city allow henceforth only the very poorest and the most wretched to unite, and then only for purposes of mutual burial.³ The men of antiquity held very dear a proper burial among their own, and scarcely anything is more touching than the pains which they took to secure it. The Cæsars, therefore, could not take from the poor man or the slave the only chance they had of obtaining decent sepulture, and the post-mortem honors of flowers, libations and anniversary banquets. They were permitted to combine for this purpose, and this is the origin of the famous *collegia tenuiorum* or the *collegia funeraticia*, which suggested to the outlawed members of the Christian religion a legal issue from their proscribed condition, or at least the securing of a legal right to meet publicly, under cover of attending to the business of a mutual burial association.

¹ Fouquet, *Des Associations religieuses chez les Grecs*.

² Trajan was so severe on the *collegia* that he would not allow the citizens of a Bithynian city to unite in forming a fire brigade, Pliny, *Epp* x., 93. It is worth noting, as an index of the profound democratic current in the Church that in every century she has encouraged the formation and protected the rights of a multitude of particular societies, confraternities, institutes, associations, guilds, sodalities, etc. The more absolute the sway and influence of Christianity, the deeper the respect of individual rights and the larger the freedom of the citizen. On this score the much maligned Middle Ages, with their rich and beneficent pullulation of private associations may challenge the golden days of the military despotism of the old and the new Cæsars, or the blighting and crushing bureaucracy of New Rome or modern Europe. See the eloquent admission of Renan, *Les Apôtres* (vol. ii, of *Les Origines du Christianisme*), p. 363:

“Nos grandes sociétés abstraites ne sont pas suffisantes pour répondre à tous les instincts de sociabilité qui sont dans l’homme. Laissez le mettre son cœur à quel que chose, chercher la consolation où il la trouve, se créer des frères, contracter des liens de cœur. Que la main froide de l’état n’intervienne pas dans ce royaume de la liberté. La vie, la joie ne renaîtront dans le monde que quand notre défiance contre les *collegia*, ce triste héritage du droit romain, aura disparu.”

³ See some remnants of the ancient legislation in the *Corpus Juris Civilis*, xlvii., 22. *De collegiis et corporibus*.

Such colleges had a constitution or *lex collegii*, a regular election of officers, a treasury or *arca communis*, a *schola* or place of meeting. They collected from each new member a fixed sum on entering, and at the death of a member a small tax was levied on the survivors. On the other hand, they looked about for rich friends and patrons, from whose gifts and legacies they might pay a fixed sum to all who attended the funeral, and offer to the *sociétaires* frequent anniversary feasts. They were supposed to meet monthly. They buried their dead, sometimes in *columbaria* or square chambers filled up on all four sides with small niches for the urns containing the ashes, sometimes in their own small cemeteries. Where the body was lost or irrecoverable, they gave an imaginary funeral (*funus imaginarium*). These humble associations furnished the needed framework for the public life of the Christians, who could not be ignorant of them, as thousands of their proselytes came from just such societies. The Christians desired very much to bury their dead apart, when possible, not only from the corporate affection they bore to one another, but because they did not burn the remains of their dead as did most pagans. Moreover, the gatherings of these societies were often large; they included both sexes, and men of all classes; there were many of them in the city, and in time the laws were so softened as to permit their meeting for religious purposes as often as they wished. Later on there sprang up beside them, tolerated societies of *Cultores Deorum*, or votaries of some particular god or goddess, and in the third century, during the relaxation of persecution, the latter societies became quite numerous. *A priori*, therefore, it is not improbable that the Christians could associate in this manner, the only legal outlet left to them, as far as we know.¹ That they actually did is insinuated by a text of Tertullian in the thirty-ninth chapter of his Apology. He is speaking precisely of licit and illicit asso-

¹ M. Gaston Boissier sums up satisfactorily the points of contact between the pagan and the Christian burial clubs: "Les ressemblances sont en effet très nombreuses entre les associations des deux cultes. Les Chrétiens possèdent aussi une caisse commune, alimentée par les contributions des fidèles; chez eux aussi les contributions se payent tous les mois; ils n'ont par moins de souci de la sépulture de leurs morts, et l'Eglise a dû dépenser une grande partie de ses revenus à construire ses immenses cimetières. Des deux côtés le respect de la hiérarchie sociale se mêle à un grand esprit d'égalité; les morts de toute condition sont confondus dans les *columbaria* comme dans les catacombes. C'est le suffrage de tour qui nomme les chefs, et il va quelquefois chercher le plus humble pour le mettre à la première place. Au moment où de pauvres affranchis arrivent aux dignités des plus élevées des colléges, un ancien esclave, le banquier Calliste, s'assoit sur la chaise de Pierre que devait occuper un Cornélius. Enfin, les repas communs ont autant d'importance dans les réunions des Chrétiens que dans les associations païennes; l'Eglise célèbre dans tous ses fêtes le festin fraternel des agapes, et, pour honorer des martyrs, les fidèles dînent sur leurs tombeaux à l'anniversaire de leur mort."—*La Religion Romaine*, ii., p. 300.

ciations, and is trying to prove that the Christians belong to the first category. "Our treasure," says he, "when we have one, is not made up of the large contributions of ambitious persons who seek honor; it is not by putting up our religion at auction that we increase our wealth. Each one brings monthly a modest contribution. He pays if he wishes to, and as he wishes, or rather, as he can; no one is compelled to give. The contributions are voluntary. We look upon that money as a pious fund which we do not spend in eating or drinking nor in indecent orgies. It helps to feed the poor and to bury them, to rear the orphans of both sexes, and to support the aged." When we compare these opposite words of Tertullian with one of the *textus classici* on the burial societies, we cannot help feeling that he is referring to a similar organization of the Christian body.² It is true that the Christians were not afraid to proclaim their numbers openly. Tertullian himself, in a famous passage already cited (*Apol.*, c. 37), vaunts their multitude, and the imperial police could not be ignorant of the frequent councils held in the latter quarter of the second century. But at the beginning of the third century the Church became the possessor of landed estates in the shape of cemeteries, once the property of individuals, but which a series of circumstances threw into her hands. Her increasing wealth demanded some secure title by which it might be protected from the unfaithful steward² as well as from the pagan informer or the apostate. This title was at hand in the character of a burial association, which form of reunion became extremely popular at this very juncture, and was extended by imperial rescript from Rome to the provinces. Such a privilege was of the highest importance for the propagation of Christianity. It gave the religion, in times of peace, a working legality, to say the least. It permitted public meetings, the excavation of catacombs, election of officers, mutual consultation, enrolment of nobles, women, foreigners, slaves, etc. Her wealthy members might easily assume the rôle of patrons that others of the same class played in the pagan corporations.

The regular distributions of the Church to the clergy, the widows, the poor and the strangers could easily be carried on at these semi-legal meetings, for the pagans were wont to give out special rations and even money on such occasions. It is worth noticing that

¹ Mandatis principalibus præcipitur præsidibus provinciarum ne patiantur esse collegia sodalicia, neve milites in castris collegia habeant. Sed permittitur tenuioribus stipem menstruam conferre dum tamen semel in mense coeant, ne sub prætextu hujus modi illicitum collegium coeat, quod non tantum in urbe sed et in Italia et in provinciis locum habere divus quoque Severus rescipit.—*Digests*, XXXVII., 22, 1.

² Nicostratum multorum criminum reum Ecclesiae deposita non modica abstulisse. . . . Spoliati ab illo pupilli, fraudatæ viduæ, pecuniæ quoque ecclesiae denegatæ.—*St. Cyprian, Epp.* 50-52 (ed. Hartel.)

the *Liber Pontificalis* attributes to this period and to Callixtus, the deacon of Zephyrin, the establishment or renovation of THE CEMETERY *par excellence*, to which his name was afterwards attached.¹ And the mentions of ecclesiastical property at Rome and elsewhere become henceforth more numerous, yet so that the *areae* and *cimiteria* form the nucleus of the growing estates of the infant churches. Thus, when Gallienus restores the confiscated property of the Christians, the cemeteries figure at the head of the list, and when Maxentius does the same, forty years later, the burial places are still the solid block of ecclesiastical wealth. De Rossi conjectures that the bishop was always inscribed as syndic or agent of these associations, in accordance with a prescription of the civil law, and he elucidates with much skill, by the aid of this supposition, the very tangled chronology of the Roman episcopal succession in the first decade of the fourth century.²

In a future article the writer proposes to treat more exhaustively the other causes which co-operated at this period in the dissemination of Christianity.

T. J. SHAHAN.

¹ *Liber Pontificalis* (Ed. Duchesne), i., 141.

² The arguments of De Rossi are neatly summed up by Northcote and Brownlow in their *Roma Sotterranea*, i., pp. 103-9. On the interesting question of the Roman confraternities cf. Mommsen and Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, iii., 131-142; and Boissier, *La Religion Romaine aux temps des Antonins*: Paris, 1884; vol. ii., pp. 239-304. Loening in his *Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenrechts*, and Alard in his *Histoire des Persecutions pendant la première moitié du III^e siècle*, give valuable details on the use of the civil right of association among the Christians. See also Cagnat, *L'Armée Romaine d'Afrique*, Paris, 1892, p. 457, for the military colleges and savings associations.

HONORIUS AND LIBERIUS, PONTIFFS.

IT is the self imposed mission of a good many Anglicans to pick flaws in the history of Catholicity. No pursuit can be more easy or more secure. In nineteen centuries of Catholic story it would be strange if there had not been scandals, and these, too, of all kinds—save only one. There has never been any scandal on the Divine side of the Church, there have been only innumerable scandals on the human side. The divine side of the Church is her teaching power, and also the Holy Mass and the Sacraments. On this side there has never been scandal. But on the human side in respect to weak Catholics—the catalogue of scandals has been continuous. It was absolutely impossible that it should be otherwise. The Church is put into the world to fight the world, and the world is quite as militant as this Church. Pride, anger, falsehood, selfishness, have been contending with authority for nineteen centuries, and they are as active against authority in the present day as they were in the day of Arius or Nestorius, of Cerinthus, of Marcion, or Martin Luther. The complications which have arisen from such enmities have been political, social, and domestic; they have poisoned history, tradition, education; and, since it is impossible for any human being to be at once a perfect master of all the historic accidents of any controversy, and of the rights or wrongs of all the dissidents in that controversy, it has naturally followed that some historians have given their own bias to the relation of (what they believed to be) the “facts” of any quarrel. Hence, it is easy for any disputant to throw stones at Catholic story, and it is as safe as it is easy or congenial. Private construction can be put upon “facts” as arbitrarily as it can be put upon “texts”; and there are always plenty of history-writers who can be quoted on the one side, as there are always plenty who can be quoted on the other. A disputant has only to make up his mind that he will argue against the Catholic Church, and shelves of books will be open to his selection, and texts of Scripture will be open to his interpretation.

We are led to these remarks by the perusal of a pamphlet, which was published not long since in America, and which abounds in curious assumptions and mis-statements too numerous to be glanced at in this article. We take only one assertion, as a specimen of a great number, and as belonging to the “historic” groove of controversy. The writer shall be quoted in his own words:

"The very dogma of infallibility ruins your case, for, if the present Pope be infallible by virtue of his high office, all Popes before him must have been infallible; yet, we have at least one of them, Honorius by name, who was condemned as a *heretic* by the Universal Church. How could an infallible Pope give an heretical decision on a matter of dogma? Yet, Honorius did this, and was anathematized as a heretic by the Sixth General Council of the Church, A. D. 681. . . . If the Church in those days had believed in Papal infallibility, the Council could not have entertained the *possibility* of his being a heretic. The bishop would have said, as you Romans are so fond of saying in words, falsely credited to St. Augustine, 'Rome has spoken; the matter is ended,' and they would have accepted the heresy of the Monothelites as Catholic truth. On the contrary, they said, Monothelism is heresy, and Pope Honorius, who maintained it, was a heretic; and so his name was coupled with *anathema*, the Church's curse." . . . "I am willing to admit that in the great controversies about faith, in early times, the Popes, with the exception of Liberius and Honorius, were generally on the right side."

Now, here we have a number of assertions, scarcely one of which can be said to be accurate. To begin with, Honorius was not condemned as a dogmatic teacher, either by the universal Church or by a provisional council. To have been condemned as a dogmatic teacher he must have pontifically taught what was false; but he never taught, pontifically, anything at all in regard to the doctrines under dispute. That doctrine was—to put it into the form of a question—Was there one Will, or were there two Wills in Jesus Christ? And the orthodox answer is, There were two Wills. Or, to quote Dr. Döllinger, in his "History of the Church," Sergius, who was a heretic, "taught that in Christ there was only one operation, and only one power of will, springing, as from its cause from the Logos, Who employed the human nature only as His instrument," whereas the right faith is that the two wills of Christ involved, necessarily, two operations. This heresy of Sergius was, in the main, a revival of the heresy of Eutyches, which had been condemned; but—as is natural with all heretics—Sergius sought to wrap up his heresy in the form of apparently honest words. Pope Honorius was uncertain how to act. He detected the heresy, but thought it more prudent to leave it to die a natural death. He therefore "recommended silence." And this silence was construed by the enemy as a tacit admission of Monothelism. It is just here that our delicate inquiry begins.

Now, there are certain broad facts on which a Catholic may insist in arguing this much debated point. 1. Pope Honorius did not teach heresy, dogmatically. 2. He was never accused of teach-

ing heresy dogmatically. 3. He was accused of negligence in not condemning it. 4. The letter which Honorius wrote to Sergius—and which is assumed to be the evidence of his guilt—was a private letter, and could not, therefore, be regarded as *ex cathedra*; had it been meant to be dogmatic it would have been addressed to Catholic bishops, but it was not sent to so much as even one Catholic bishop. 5. This letter contained no heresy, not in the sense of a dogmatic affirmation. 6. The Sixth General Council did not condemn Pope Honorius for having taught what was contrary to the faith, but for having neglected to teach what was the faith. 7. Both the Pope who presided at that Council, and the Popes who succeeded to that Pope, affirmed the infallibility of every Pontiff. 8. The Sixth General Council also affirmed infallibility in regard to every Pontiff who had lived. 9. What was blamed in Pope Honorius was his negligence in his stewardship—his not teaching infallibly when he *could* have done so, and his not teaching infallibly when he *ought* to have done so.

Now we have nothing to do with the private motives of Honorius—as to his not teaching the Church in a troubled time. We have only to do with the condemnation by the council in regard to his negligence in his stewardship. To quote Dr. Döllinger—and we prefer to keep only to his statements, because he is thought so much of by Protestants—he says in his work on “The First Ages of Christianity and the Church,” when he is speaking of the stewardship of the Pope: “And in this House, built upon him, Peter is to have the duties and powers, not of the Master of the House—that Christ is, and remains—but of the steward. These were promised him under the symbol of the keys, whereby he is enabled to open the treasures of the House, to guard the spiritual stores and possessions of the Church, doctrine and means of grace.” This was Dr. Döllinger’s idea of the stewardship, so that we can clearly see that, in the neglect of the stewardship, there was the neglect of what *ought* to have been done, not the doing of what ought *not* to have been done.

The distinction is so broad that it should be unnecessary to dwell upon it, yet there are some writers who ignore it altogether. If the Popes were impeccable, it would have been impossible for Honorius to have neglected any part of his duty. But no Pope, not even St. Peter, was impeccable. Infallibility applies only to the teaching sound doctrine, whenever the Pope declares his intention of teaching the Church. It does not apply to character in any sense, nor does it guarantee the Pope against weakness.

To take a few of the points which are disputed in regard to “the scandal” about Honorius. It is conceded that the first letter of Honorius, which he wrote to the heretic Sergius—the only letter

which is preserved in its entirety—did not contain any dogmatic statement. Honorius even warned Sergius in this letter that he had no intention of writing dogmatically: “Non nos oportet unam vel duas operationes definientes predicare” (“we have not to teach or to define either one or two operations”). Hence it is not strange that in that letter we do not trace any intention to teach. The highest authorities of the period have expressly stated that they detected no formal heresy in that letter; to wit, Pope John IV. and St. Maximus, whose judgment it were impossible to dispute. Dr. Döllinger, in his “History of the Church,” says that Sergius “wrote a most artfully composed letter to gain to his side the Pontiff Honorius,” and he added that “Honorius suffered himself to be misguided” by the perfidious tactics of Sergius. “For this,” says Dr. Döllinger, “Pope Leo II. placed the error of Honorius in his *inactivity*”—a very different thing indeed from teaching heresy. Indeed, it has been maintained by many authorities that not one word that Honorius said or wrote could justify the charge of any heresy, either in his pontifical capacity or in his private or friendly relations.

It is worth while mentioning that Dr. Döllinger makes the suggestive observation, that the Greeks at Florence, who would have rejoiced to produce Honorius on their side, did not so much as allude to him.

We may, however, now turn to the Sixth General Council, which is assumed to have condemned Pope Honorius, not only for negligence or inactivity, but, as some critics assert, for teaching heresy; and we may show, without difficulty, that such an assumption is negatived both by words and by acts. Pope Agatho, who presided in part at the deliberations of the Sixth General Council, himself believed in Papal Infallibility. These were his words, addressed to the council: “The splendid Light of Faith, transmitted successively from the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul, by means of their successors, even to our humility, has been preserved pure and without spot, without ever having been obscured by heresy or defiled by error.” And again, in a letter to the emperor, he says, “The Lord and Saviour of us all, the author of our faith, has promised that the faith of Peter shall never fail, and commanded him to confirm his brethren. No one is ignorant that *all* the Apostolic Pontiffs have done this with confidence.” And elsewhere he affirms that “The Roman See has *never* turned aside from the path of truth to any error whatsoever; whose authority, as of the Prince of all the Apostles, the whole Catholic Church at all times, and the Universal Councils faithfully embracing, have in all respects followed.” And these words of St. Agatho were written, be it repeated, while he was judging the conduct of Pope Honorius, and while the Sixth General Council was judging it.

But what said the council itself? The answer is so plain as to be conclusive. At the close of the council, and after the condemnation of the Monothelites, all the bishops subscribed these letters of Pope Agatho, using these words with regard to them: "Our eyes saw the ink and the paper, but our souls heard Peter speaking by the mouth of Agatho. . . . Therefore we leave what should be done to you, as Prelate of the first See of the Universal Church, standing on the firm rock of faith, having read, through the letter, of the true confession sent by your Paternal Blessedness to our most religious emperor, and which we recognize as divinely written from the Supreme Head of the Apostles."

Subsequently, when Pope Leo II. gave his sanction to the decrees of this council, he thus clearly and explicitly spoke of Honorius: "Honorius qui hanc apostolicam ecclesiam non apostolicæ traditionis doctrina lustravit, sed profana traditione immaculatam maculari permisit." ("Honorius, who did not make this apostolic See resplendent with doctrine, but by a profane treason allowed the faith to be exposed to subversion.") And so, again, in his letter to the Bishops of Spain, the same Pope, Leo II., wrote; "Flammam heretici dogmatis non, ut decuit Apostolicam auctoritatem, incipientem extinxit sed negligendo confovit." ("He did not extinguish at its commencement the flame of heretical doctrine, as became his apostolic authority, but by negligence nourished it.") Not a word is here said about heresy, but only about negligence or inactivity, as Dr. Döllinger has very lucidly insisted. Pope Leo and Pope Agatho, like the Sixth General Council, fully recognized two truths in this sad story, and not only recognized, but affirmed them: 1. That the Holy See had never gone wrong and could never go wrong upon any point that was of faith unto salvation; 2. That Honorius had cast reproach upon the Holy See by neglecting to use the apostolic powers which were *his*, as they were those of all pontiffs.

Briefly, then, we have an Œcumenical Council, while judging the case of Honorius, and pronouncing him guilty of negligence, affirming that Honorius was *included* in the occupants of that Holy See which had "never been obscured by heresy or defiled by error." We have the infallibility of all pontiffs taught directly by that General Council which condemned Pope Honorius for "inactivity"; and moreover, we have this affirmation in the very last sitting of the Council. We have, too, the decision of Pope Leo II., that Honorius was guilty of allowing ("permisit") the spread of a detestable heresy, and for the very reason that, being an infallible Pontiff, he was bound to have at once said "anathema." The whole story is demonstrative of the zeal of the Catholic Church for active duty in the suppression of error, as well as of the insistence of the Catholic Church upon the supreme power and prerog-

ative of the pontiffs. Controversionalists who are on the wrong side of judicial estimate, ought to recognize in this episode the existence of that catholic spirit which is so obviously wanting in their own communities; a spirit which will not brook "inactivity" nor "negligence," but which insists on the instant exercise of authority.

We may yet, however, linger upon a few points, since this controversy has been bitterly revived, and it is most difficult to satisfy all objectors. Thus, it may be urged in the defence of Honorius, that in his second letter to Sergius he expressly asserted Two Operations; for he confessed to Two Natures in Christ, "unmixed, undivided, unchanged"; repudiating, however, the formula "Two Operations," which he considered to be too "grammarian" to be desirable. Detestable as was such weakness, such pusillanimity, we can readily understand why he fostered it: first, on the ground that he was grossly deceived by Sergius's letters, and next, on the ground that he was timorous as to casting a stumbling-block in the way of the conversion of the Monophysites. Such cowardice, such feebleness, were reprehensible, and more than one council anathematized him. Yet, when the Sixth General Council affirmed that his letter written to Sergius was "altogether alien from the Apostolic dogmas, and followed the false doctrine of the heretics," we have to bear in mind that they were judging that letter as a *letter*, not as a pope's dogmatic teaching. Indeed, the very wording of the letter shows that it was meant only to be conciliatory—to be, as we should now say, worldly-wise—since it avoided precise formula or affirmation. Honorius, in that letter, seems to reason in this way: There were Two Natures in Christ, and therefore there were Two Wills; yet, since the Humanity of Christ was in perfect union with the Divinity—hostility between Two Perfect Natures being inconsiderable—it follows, that to *insist* on two distinct Operations would be to insist on the possibility of inharmoniousness. Such causistry was pronounced culpable and contemptible.

The obvious conclusion is, that Honorius was not condemned for formal heresy—still less for dogmatically teaching formal heresy—but for his feeble wish to temporize under difficulties. He acted just like a modern Archbishop of Canterbury; taking "*quieta non movere*" for his motto; and gently smiting with the left hand while caressing with the right hand, in utter forgetfulness of his duty to "strengthen the brethren." But whereas the Anglican Church would not have thought of summoning a council for the purpose of anathematizing an archbishop, but, on the contrary, would rather have complimented the archbishop on "the extreme liberality of his views," the Catholic Church did, in the Sixth Gen-

eral Council, judge and anathematize Honorius ; not for teaching heresy but for trifling with it. The attitude of that Council towards Honorius might perhaps be expressed in these words: What you aimed at was to impose a disciplinary law, that there should be no insistence on the disputed words "Two Operations." You never *required* the profession of faith in that formula, and you never *forbade* its being professed by any Catholic. Nevertheless, you have been an unworthy chief pastor, and this Council condemns you with anathema.

II.

Liberius is another name which is coupled with Honorius as suggesting fallibility in the pontiffs. Here, again, let us consult Dr. Döllinger, for he is much esteemed as a reliable historian by those who seek for champions in antagonism.

Now Dr. Döllinger evidently did not think much about this "scandal," for he dismissed it in a little more than a page. The historian who could dwell through a whole chapter on the Primacy and Supremacy of the Holy See; who could assure us, in his "History of the Church," that "it was acknowledged to be the prerogative of the first see in the Christian world that the Bishop of Rome could be judged by no man. . . . It was a thing unheard of that the Head of the Church should be placed in judgment before his own subjects. . . . He who was not in communion with the Bishop of Rome was not truly in the Catholic Church"—could only think it worth while to say of that controversy: "Many modern historians have undertaken to prove that the 'fall' of Liberius must be regarded as no more than a fiction of the Arians." And then he shows briefly why this may have been so. He argues that the allegation that "a formula was presented to Liberius by the Arians, with the object of getting him to authorize Arianism," may be true or may be not true; nor does it matter, for if he did sign the formula, the formula was harmless, being "of such a nature that orthodox Catholics might without difficulty submit to it." Yet he seems to side with the historians who maintain that "the heretics corrupted those parts of the works of St. Athanasius, and the fragments of St. Hilary in which the account of it is maintained." And he particularly notices that "it seems that Sulpicius Severus, Socrates, and Theodoret knew nothing of such a tale of the Pope, for they make no mention of it, and state that Constantius was compelled, by the prayers of the Roman women and by an insurrection of the people, to permit the return of Liberius to Rome." We have to bear in mind that in those troublous times, when Arianism had swallowed up half Christendom—possessing, indeed, as much power and popularity

as Protestantism does in this century—it was most difficult to get at the true version of Arian tactics, most difficult to know who could be believed. Liberius was an exile from Rome. The civil power had banished him for this very reason that he had resisted the Arians and the Arian Emperor, so that his action was as hampered by his surroundings as his teaching was misrepresented by his enemies. Yet as to that teaching, two things appear to be certain: (1) He never wrote nor taught what was Arian; (2) He did write and teach what was Catholic. We have, indeed, testimonies to his orthodoxy, which are sufficient. Thus we may ask: Would Pope Siricius, in his letter to Himeric, have spoken of Liberius as “blessed,” had the faintest taint of any heresy attached to him? Would St. Ambrose have declared him to be “a man of holy memory” had he abandoned the faith under persecution? Would St. Basil have styled him “most blessed” if he had set any example of unfaithfulness? We may dismiss, then, every imputation of “teaching heresy.” Liberius was sorely tempted and tried, but it is certain that he never taught Arianism.

Writing of events which took place fifteen hundred years ago, we are necessarily more or less in the dark as to the details which are commonly called “historical.” If even as to events which take place in our own day, and of which we read in the daily party-newspapers, there is a difficulty in separating the wheat from the chaff—the facts from the coloring of prejudice—how much more when we attempt to sit in judgment on a controversy whose period was the middle of the fourth century, should we be wary both of believing and discrediting.

Now our first point in attempting to fathom this “scandal” must be the inquiry into the nature of the provocation. We find, then, to begin with, that Liberius was banished from Rome *because* of the firm support he gave to the Nicene faith; *because* of his constancy in orthodoxy. This is certainly a strong point to begin with, nor do we know that any disputant has questioned it. Our second point is that, even assuming that Liberius subscribed a formula which was presented to him by heretics, that formula was not in its wording heretical. At least this was the estimate of Dr. Döllinger. Our third point may be, that even if it had been heretical, Liberius taught nothing, imposed nothing, in the act of subscribing that formula; for, in the first place, being under persecution, he must have subscribed it under tyranny, under force; and in the next place, he could not have meant it to be *ex cathedra*, for he was cut off from all friends, all counselors. Cardinal Newman has remarked upon this point, that an English judge who should be carried away by bandits, and then forced to subscribe a doubtful document, could not be held responsible for judicial errors

which were not his, but those of his captors. However, there is really no uncertainty as to the subscription; while as to the formula itself, it was equivocal. And our fourth point might be, that after these troubled days were over, and Liberius was restored to his see, he confirmed the orthodox Council of Alexandria in the year 362, and therefore shortly after his exile.

And here again, as in the case of Honorius, we have the judgment of a Pope and a General Council in regard to the Pontifical Orthodoxy of Liberius. The Sixth General Council, which was held three centuries after the time of the assumed fall of Liberius, declared, as we saw just now, that "*all* the Apostolic Pontiffs had kept the faith"—had "*never* turned aside from the path of truth." This Council therefore exculpated Liberius. And at this point we may well turn to a larger grip of the subject—to the comprehending of the lesser within the greater.

III.

No one can now be infallible as to history for the simple reason that all chroniclers have been fallible. Even the Supreme Pontiff does not claim to be infallible as to history—as to this fact or that fact in natural story. The "infallibility of the Pope" is hedged round with such precaution that the Vatican Council has left us no room for question as to when the Pope teaches infallibility, when not. The Pope himself is subject to error like other men. As a private doctor he may err; as a writer of books he may make mistakes; even as to faith and morals, when only discussing them privately, he would not enjoy immunity from fallibility. It is only when he, "using his office as Pastor and Doctor of all Christians, defines a doctrine of faith or morals to be held by the whole Church, he, by the divine assistance promised to him in the blessed Peter, possesses that infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer was pleased to invest his Church in the definition of doctrine on faith and morals, and that therefore such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable in their own nature, and not because of the consent of the Church."¹

Now it is a happy thing that we can turn away from doubtful history to a faith which is not doubtful but infallible. General Councils, whose decisions have been confirmed by the Pontiff, are not simply authorities as to probability, but authorities as to indisputable certainty. This being so, we turn away from a "scandal" in the fourth century, or a scandal in the first half of the seventh century, and inquire of General Councils, not whether any Pope has privately erred, but whether any Pope has taught the Church falsely?

¹ *Pastor Æternus*, cap. 4.

The answer has been as plain as is the question. The Sixth General Council, already quoted, has settled the question as to Honorius, and therefore also the question as to Liberius. But since this Sixth Council there have been other councils, of which the ruling has been based upon infallibility. We need not speak of the Second Council of Lyons (1274), when the schismatic Greeks were admitted to Catholic union, and acknowledged the Pope as the Head of the whole Church; nor of the Council of Constance (1414), when the schism caused by false popes was healed, and the only true Pope was acclaimed by the Council; nor of the Council of Trent (1545-1562), which defined truth in opposition to Protestantism; but we will speak only of the last Council, that of the Vatican, which finally settled the root and basis of authority. At this Council the dogma of the Infallibility of the Pope—previously recognized in the First Council of Ephesus, 431, and more fully declared in the Council of Florence, 1438—was solemnly affirmed and defined. At this Council also the dogma of a Personal God was first explicitly affirmed or defined—in answer to the skepticism of some modern heretics; just as the dogma of the Immortality of the Soul was first affirmed or defined at the Fifth Council of Lateran, 1512—in answer to the speculations of weak believers.

Our point is that the decisions of the Vatican Council settle forever the two "scandals" we have been speaking of; for the greater postulate being accepted that a pontiff cannot teach falsehood, the lesser postulate—that no particular pontiff has taught falsehood—must be necessarily included in the greater. "But this is to beg the question," may reply the objector; "at least it is to invert the reasoning process." So it would be, historically. But here again the greater takes precedence of the lesser, because, as to faith, the Catholic Church is infallible, and authority is the basis of faith; whereas, in regard to history, Catholics and skeptics are alike fallible, and share the painful infirmity of "getting wrong."

We may be pardoned for adding a perhaps relevant observation, which, however, lies outside the main argument.

That in the long period of nearly nineteen centuries, and in the history of two hundred and fifty-eight popes, these two instances of Honorius and Liberius are all that can be urged against infallibility, must be regarded as rather demonstrating the weakness of objectors than the untenability of orthodoxy. There were four popes in the first century, eleven in the second, fifteen in the third, eleven in the fourth, twelve in the fifth, thirteen in the sixth, twenty in the seventh, thirteen in the eighth, nineteen in the ninth, twenty-four in the tenth, eighteen in the eleventh, sixteen in the twelfth,

seventeen in the thirteenth, ten in the fourteenth, thirteen in the fifteenth, seventeen in the sixteenth, eleven in the seventeenth, eight in the eighteenth, and six in the ninety-three years of the nineteenth; and yet all that non-Catholics can find to say about the whole number is that one of them was reproached for "inactivity," and another was grossly libelled by Arians. Point to any list of non-Catholic ecclesiastics through a period of even one century or half a century, and how many of them could bear the inquiry into "inactivity," how many of them could claim to have condemned heresy? It is a high compliment—if we may use a conventional expression—which heresy always pays to Catholicity, that it *expects* to find perfection in all the popes; and it is a still higher compliment that it can find no worse thing to complain of than such weakness, here and there, as is common to human nature, or such frailty as does not touch the Teaching Power. The remark may be worth noting, yet it must have often occurred to Catholics, that no pope of doubtful repute in regard to sanctity ever professed to define dogma, to teach the Church. This is a truth, though it is not worth while to insist on it. On the other hand, every pontiff who has been illustrious as a teacher has also been illustrious for his sanctity. Neither truth need be dwelt upon as of much import, since the promises were not given to character or to superiority, but solely to office, to headship. Yet take the whole line of two hundred and fifty-eight popes—beginning with thirty-three martyrs, and now continued by Leo XIII.—and we may confidently assert that nineteen centuries of Catholicity have been headed with a saintly Host of Pontiffs.

ARTHUR F. MARSHALL.

THE GARDEN OF BALSAM.

AT Matariyeh, about six miles north of Cairo, and a furlong from the site of the world-renowned city of Heliopolis, the biblical On, is a garden whither pilgrims from eastern and western Christendom were wont to flock in early and mediæval days, and to which the children of the Church in the venerable Orient still resort as being one scene of a portion of the early life in the sacred boyhood of Jesus Christ. After having seen Jerusalem, Bethlehem and the Jordan's stream, the primitive palmers sought to pay their devotions at the shrines of Alexandria, Matariyeh and Mount Sinai, and Rymer in his "*Fœdera*" is said to give many a license for the making of these pious travels from our own occidental shores. Prophecy, tradition and probability, all seem to unite in making Matariyeh the spot of the Repose in Egypt for at least some space of time, and it is not to be lightly ignored that Jew, Copt, and Saracen, the faiths of Israel, Christ and Mohammed, should unite in their testimony to this fact. The tradition is that the holy wayfarers came across the parching Arabian desert by the usual caravan route, the same as that by which the patriarch Jacob journeyed together with his sons, and made their way to Heliopolis, the chief city—the first large town in fact—which they came to upon the desert's border. We can scarcely think of that advent as we stand upon the walls of sun-dried brick of that city and gaze across the sandy wastes without the words rising spontaneously to one's lips, "*Quæ est ista quæ ascendit per desertum sicut virgula fumi ex aromatibus myrrhæ et thuris? . . . Quæ est ista, deliciis affluens, innixa super dilectum suum?*" Arrived at Heliopolis they begged for water to quench their thirst, and being refused from house to house, Mary with her divine Child sank wearied out with travel and the fatigues of the way at the foot of a sycamore fig without the southern gate of the city, when, like to Hagar of old, her God revealed to her a spring of pure water whereat to satisfy their need. Certainty in the Almighty power of the Creator made Man led affectionate devotion to cluster many details around this tree and well, all of which are possible, but which, to those whose faith is a feeble plant and only nourished by the most potent truths, seem to make dim the light of the sun and thus becoming hindrances lead them to refuse the veneration which this spot would receive if it were not connected with the profoundest feelings of the human heart. This is the scene of the *Réposos* of the mediæval

artists, known from popular legend, mystery play and carol song, and confirmed to them by pilgrims' writings and crusaders' story.

If every intellectual traveller, when at Cairo, makes a visit to the remains of the great city of Heliopolis, why does not every reverent one do so to the Balsam Garden of Matariyeh? True science and religion must ever travel together, and on this road, head and heart may find their healthiest exercise in the contemplations aroused by these deeply moving spots. The contrast between our pilgrimage thither to-day and that of the palmers of old time marks both our loss and our gain; we have lost the bright flame of their faith but have gained in ease of transport; the difficulties they had to contend with are no longer ours; we experience nothing like them anywhere, and even for a stranger to go inland in Morocco is not so perilous as it was for Christians to come here; for even after a great expenditure of time, patience and money, the dangers of the road were constant. To-day we can drive without aught to disturb our ease, save it be the dust, from our comfortable hotel to the very garden gate, and see things which saints and princes have desired to see and yet could not see them and which were denied to the earnest hearts of thousands of crusading knights and nobles; and yet some of that Christian army must have trod these garden walks, for it was in the fields between it and Cairo that Amaury, King of Jerusalem, lay encamped in November, 1168, as he proceeded to attack the Saracens' capital, and only a heavy ransom prevented his executing that wise decision. Think of this, however, you who drive along this road, that Christendom in the purest days of its chivalry, in the most earnest days of its faith, and the most refined in its art, the thoughts of which became the wisdom of succeeding generations, that here it gathered the noblest of its sons in intellect, position, and wealth, ready and happy to die for the Child who played beneath the sycamore's shade of Matariyeh.

For the account we now give we will describe the approach from Cairo and also the garden itself, interweaving with our description any traditional lore which we have been able to gather, thereby illustrating many a detail which we find in the work of the artists of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, whether it be in wood or stone, or on canvass or glass, and we shall see how many an old-world legend or name of flower, bird, or insect travelled from this source to our northern strands and became part of the folk-lore of all nations.

Passing out of Cairo past the Abbassieh Barracks, a broad roadway is planted with the acacia or mimosa lebbour, and leads to Matariyeh. Your carriage wheels sink deep in the sandy soil and the dust rising in clouds covers you and the cushions and pro-

duces a travel-stained appearance before you have gone a couple of miles. If care were taken of the road, it would be the most beautiful drive out of the city, for these lebbeur trees flourish wonderfully well and have quite naturalized themselves since their introduction into the country some forty years ago. Before you reach the barracks you pass the small European hospital where the Sisters of St. Joseph have a house which, by its name, seems to be, as it were, the lodge to the drive that leads to their patron's place of sojourn. Some distance further on we come to the palace of El-Koubbeh, the property of the viceroy, surrounded by rare trees and gardens, which are beautiful for this grassless country. That dried-up and contorted moss which you see upon the tree stumps is called by the Arabs *schaker rabba*, or "giving thanks to the Lord God," because immediately it is watered by rain or flood, it expands as if in gratitude for the welcome gift. It is the *Lycopodium imbricatum* or *L. bryopteris* of Linnæus. As you plough through the light soil, haply you may see by the roadside many an animal whose name is known to you from the storied page of Egypt's history. "Pharaoh's Rat" is that little creature, the size of a cat, which pricks up its ears at your approach, and which, without moving a limb, turns its eyes on every side to note the cause of alarm. It is the sacred ichneumon of the ancients, the mongoose, once the pet in every temple of this land, perchance for the same reason that it is still employed in Cairene houses, viz., as a mouse-killer. It is an easily-tamed, sweet-tempered, gentle little animal, worshiped, as we think, and mummified in parts of this country, but, more probably only revered as a type, on account of its antipathy to serpents and crocodiles—the prototypes of our dragons. Isn't it told by Herodotus how it lay in wait for these latter monsters to fall asleep as they basked in the sun upon the muddy banks of the Nile, and that immediately their lower jaw fell, in jumped the nimble mongoose, who plunged into their stomach and ate his way out to the light, thus slaying the brute like a St. Margaret of Cortona? and how, in its contests with deadly snakes, it knew an antidote among the herbs to the poison of their fangs?

That snow-white bird with stork-like appearance, which, at first sight, you think must be the Sacred Ibis, is not that, but the Heron-Driver (*Ardeola russata*). The slender form and elegant carriage of this bird, together with the beautiful purity of its color, and the tender melancholy of its air, make most travelers think that this must be the oft-mentioned *Ibis religiosa*. But that is rarely seen, and is black, with a curving beak, as you will soon learn from the temple walls when you go up the river.

It is of interest as we approach Heliopolis the city of the Phœ-

nix and the Mary Well of Matariyeh, to think of the legends with which the stork (*Ardca ciconia*) is invested by Teutonic peoples. In Holland, Denmark and Germany it is known universally as the Fire-fowl and Baby-bringer, and is always regarded as sacred; its presence is everywhere welcomed and the house highly honored where it can be induced to make its nest. We all know the sight of the storks' nests from the towers of Strasburg Cathedral, perched on high, like that of the fabled phoenix, upon the highest point of the dwelling, usually the chimney-stack. In children's tales their own advent into this world is associated with this bird; they say they are brought from the *Kinderbrunnen*, or child's fountain, by the stork, being the gift of the good lady of the spring, the Mother of God, to their parents, and the bird often bites the mother, causing her to stay abed awhile. There seems a strange refrain through this folk-tale of the Phoenix legend, with its nest of balsam or myrrh and the child-life of our Lord near the Holy Well.

You will pass by many a group of curlew, which the Egyptian Arabs call *karrawan*, and say that its cry forms the words addressed to the Deity: "*Lak, Lak, Lak, la Shariah Kalak, fi'l mulk*," i.e., "To Thee, to Thee, to Thee belongs the sovereignty of the world, without partner and comparison"—words which instance how all earnest religious peoples love to associate God and His creation in constant relation of prayer and praise. One legend, among many relating to these birds, tells how the Blessed Virgin had a handmaid who stole her scissors, in the stay at Matariyeh perchance! She remained impenitent and would not confess her sin, at least in her human form; for she became a curlew, with a forked and scissor-like tail, telling her lasting shame, and the only cry she could utter was the too-tardy repentant one which the Swedes say is "*Tyvit! Tyvit!*" "I stole them! I stole them!" The story at least proves that Eastern morality in the matters of *meum* and *tuum* has not improved, and has the doctrine of heredity by this time to neutralize the consciousness of guilt.

When about four and one-half miles from Cairo we pass a road to the left leading to a plantation of cassia (*C. fistulosa*, L.), whose magnificent yellow bunches of flowers afford a lovely sight in the spring-time, and whose long blackish pods of sweet pulp yield the cassia-stick of the druggists. Another road on the right conducts to an ill kept olive yard; but these trees do not seem to flourish in Egypt, the soil of which is too rich for their ascetic temperaments. We cannot go by on our visit to Matariyeh without a thought at these spots of the simile to the *Oliva speciosa* of her, all of whose "garments smell of balsam, aloes and cassia," in the affectionate language of mediæval Christendom.

As we are drawing nigh to the object of our drive, it may be well for us to refer to what we have already stated, that prophecy and probability, as well as tradition, seem to combine in making Matariyeh the scene of the sojourn of the Holy Family. "Out of Egypt have I called my son" had a literal as well as a spiritual meaning, after the manner of all of the Holy Scriptures. The literal refers to the calling of Israel in the time of Moses, the spiritual to the calling of our Lord on the death of Herod. That there is this double signification is shown by St. Matthew, who uses the prophecy;¹ and if we believe in the inspiration of the Sacred Writings we must recognize that both significations had the same Author and the same Interpreter. Next, the Egypt from which Israel was called was this land of Goshen, and in Osee the reference is to that part, and its application to our Lord is the same. If this be so far true, the question follows, where in Goshen would the Holy Family stay? Was it at one of its three chief towns—Rameses, Pithoum or On? And here constant and unvarying tradition says the last, and there is no such association with either of the other two.² Another point is remarkable. The fact of our Lord's life and residence having been chiefly passed among the Jews has often been especially noted. He spent almost His entire life in Judah and Israel, and though He visited the Decapolis and the Phœnician colonies of Tyre and Sidon, He did not stay there. He declared His mission to be to "the lost sheep of the House of Israel," and it is very striking how His coming into Egypt seems like a fulfilment of that pursuit of His after His wandering people. It is worth while to read Jeremias to see how continually the prophet protests against the Jews leaving their land, and how, rebellious to all restraints and deaf to all warnings, they went off and settled in Cahpanes, Noph and other places, and it would give a vigorous interpretation to our Lord's parables to think of this visit of His here to have been the full meaning in His mind when He said: "Last of all, He sent His Son," when prophets had failed. It was at On or Heliopolis that the Jews said Jacob the Patriarch was met by his son Joseph, and here Jeremias was brought compulsorily by his emigrating countrymen, and here he wrote the book of the Lamentations. At the Christian era there were nearly a million Jews in this Lower Egypt, forming a colony governed by their own laws, of which the centre was in the prefecture of Heliopolis. Nowhere else were they so numerous. Does not this exclusive mission point, therefore, to the neighborhood of that city? That this is the opinion of those learned men

¹ ii., 15.

² See Patrizzi, *De Interp.*, S. S., i., 284, 298, 299, 327, 363, 384; *De Evang.*, iii., Diss. 31, 32.

whose study is theology is shown by reference to St. Bonaventura,¹ Barradius,² Ludovicus de Dieu,³ Cornelius a Lapide,⁴ and a multitude of authorities cited by them. There is a record of the Holy Family's coming here in the "Gospel of the Infancy of the Lord Jesus Christ," a narrative which is referred to by Eusebius,⁵ who flourished early in the fourth century. It is only worth mentioning as a very early occurrence of the tradition, for the work is probably the work of a compiler in the first centuries. It was originally, perhaps, compiled in Syriac, and is well known from the Arabic version published in Latin by Hy. Sike, at Crêves, in 1697. The Nestorian Christians of Persia and India use it, and the Copts likewise, we believe; and it is not lightly to be passed by that these last, the native Christian Church of Egypt, of uninterrupted continuity from the days of St. Mark, should ever have maintained the tradition of the Garden of Balsam.

Beyond this we at present do not know of any written record of the tradition previous to the great persecution of the Copts by the Arab conquerors in the eighth century, but probably when students with time and opportunity turn their attention to the ecclesiastical history of Egypt we shall be astonished at the stores of information on many things which lie at present unknown. It is unfortunate that our intimate acquaintance with that land is so recent, that when we go there we are appalled with our ignorance, and the histories and arts of Pharaohs, Ptolemys, and Saracens attract visitors more than those of the native church.

But here we are at the village of Matariyeh, where among its 400 or 500 inhabitants only three or four families of Christians are to be found; we pass through it and come to a small plantation at whose boundary is the Garden of Balsam or Myrrh. An avenue about seventy yards long leads from the road between banana, orange, palm, cassia and other trees; on our left about half way is a large double sakyeh or water-wheel which is raising the sweet waters from the holy well now far below the surface by reason of the yearly deposit of the Nile's flood, and before us is the venerable sycamore known as the Virgin's tree. We do not now find the balsam growing which once flourished here and gave the spot its name, but there are few trees around with which Christian associations are not connected by their use as types or similes in the sacred writings of our faith. Let us take each subject of interest separately in order not to confuse our minds with this garden's fruitful considerations, and let us reverently listen to the traditions of the spot with minds neither credu-

¹ *Vita Hi.*, xii.

³ *Hist. Hi. Faverian*, pp. 587, 583.

⁶ *Hist. Eccles.*, vi., 12.

² *Hist. Evang.*, T. I, Lib. x., Ch. 9.

⁴ *Eccles.*, xxiv.

lous nor skeptical, and with hearts tender towards all memories of Jesus, Mary, and Joseph. In these days of scornful indifference to the mediæval records of the Christian faith, when the superficiality of men's thoughts and reading make them dismiss with the superb insolence of ignorance all the ancient traditions of Christendom as "the inventions of monks," and lead them to defile the memory of their ancestors by attributing to one-half of them lives of fraudulent imposition and to the other half of mental imbecility, it is well to come to this land of Egypt and learn the pitifulness of our century's pride and the source of this land's strength. The source of this land's strength we say, for of its wisdom and power we shall have no doubt if once we make the Nile's voyage; neither, if we make that visit intelligently shall we hesitate in attributing the source of it all to their reverence for their gods and for every natural revelation they could find which reminded them of them. This too was the spirit of the men of the *moyen âge*, and it is with such dispositions we would come to Matariyeh's tree and fountain.

Whether this be the identical tree that shaded the Holy Family matters but little, for it is not as a relic that we need regard it, but as a monument marking a sacred spot; still we will not omit to consider the possibilities of the case; for we understand that it is not unreasonable that this should be a surviving part of the original tree. It is only in name identical with that we know in Europe as the sycamore, which is either a maple or else the false sycamore or bead tree. This is known to botanists as the *Ficus Sycamorus* or sycamore fig, and in its native land as *Ficus Pharaonis* or Pharaoh's fig. This is indigenous and grows equally well here in Egypt, in Palestine, and Syria; its wood is grainless, close, and incorruptible, and of it are made the magnificent sarcophagi which taken from their tombs now abound in the museums of Europe, and which after three thousand years show no signs of decay. This is the "sycamore" up which Zaccheus climbed to see our Lord pass by, and probably this is the species of "fig tree" upon which Judas is said to have hanged himself without the Joppa gate of Jerusalem. Its leaves are like those of the alder, and its great rounded head of foliage of a sombre green is a frequent sight in this Lower Egypt. In summer and autumn it bears upon small leafless shoots a quantity of round, flesh-colored fruit, of a small size, which the Arabs eat while young, and whose ripening they hasten by making a small incision near the eye; when gathered it has a fresh, sweet flavor, which recalls the apple and strawberry; the skin is thin, the flesh white and watery like that of the Japanese medlar; it will not keep, but after a day or two becomes sickly and unpleasant. Such is the character of the sycamore fig.

This one here is placed in an open space bounded by orange trees whose sweet blossoms perfume the air ; it is still a fine and beautiful tree, and though leaning considerably to one side through the loss of a great portion, is fairly sound, and with a crown of leafage over twenty feet in circumference. The enormous roots which support the trunk appear to be of exceeding antiquity and a wooden palisade fences them from violation. The Arab guardians admit the pilgrim to kneel beneath the branches and recite his *Fater* and *Ave*, but permit no curiosity-monger to injure the stem, and are as jealous of its history as the native Christian himself. France should feel a double interest in its preservation, for when in 1800 Kléber pursued the Turks to the walls of Heliopolis he came upon this Garden of Balsam and cut his name with his sword upon its trunk ;¹ and upon a more peaceful occasion, when the Empress Eugenie came to open the Suez Canal, the Viceroy Ismail bought this garden and presented that pious lady with the Virgin's Tree.

Sandys, in his "Travels" in 1610, gives some of the legends which have gathered around it. He says, "There standeth an overgrown fig-tree, wh. opened (as they report) to receive our Saviour & His mother, then hardly escaping the pursuers ; closing againe till the pursuite was past ; then againe dividing as now it remaineth. A large hole there is through one of the sides of the leaning bulk ; this (they say) no basturd can thred, but shall stick fast by the middle. The tree is all be-hackt for the wood thereof is reported of soveraigne virtue." The legend of a tree having opened its wood to receive the poor fugitives, is of very early date, but it is to the juniper that this is generally attributed, and we are inclined to think that it has been transferred thence.

There is also connected with this Matariyeh tree the legend of how the spider contributed its share to conceal the refugees by weaving its web across the severed trunk, thus diverting any suspicion of recent disturbance there. We may trace this folk-lore legend to our own western shores, for Mr. Henderson repeats a story told him by the Rev. T. B. Dykes, of how an old lady rebuked the clergyman for attempting to kill one of these insects which he observed near her bed. She said, with much earnestness, that they ought not to be injured, for we should remember how when our Lord lay in the manger of Bethlehem, the spider came and spun a beautiful web, which protected the Holy Babe from all dangers which surrounded Him. Napier confirms the Scotch regard for the spider's life, and they say :

"If you wish to live and thrive,
Let the spider run alive,"

¹ *Corresp. d'Orient*, libre 141.

attributing its immunity to a similar cause. In Ireland and most lands we hear the same story. The Cossacks of the Aral call the *Aranea speciosa*, Pallas, "God's spider" (Voshie misgir), from having been the insect of the "Cross spider" (*Aranea diadema*), which bears a triple-cross upon its back, a fact which is allied to a like thought, and is intensified by its love of the hazel, a tree which sheltered the Holy Family upon the flight to Matariyeh.

Baedecker states that this Virgin's tree was planted in 1672, but that cannot possibly be true, for Sandys, visiting it sixty years earlier, as we have related, describes it as we see it to-day, and eighty years later a naturalist who was a friend and pupil of Linnæus, came and examined it, and considered that it must be then at least three hundred years old.¹ Thévenot, in 1657, tells of a part having become separated and fallen the year previous, but the remainder stood, and was "fort vieux." The Protestant travellers, Jean Wessling (1730) and Dr. Sepp,² saw the tree, and affirm their conviction that it was the same as was honored in the second century; and the great traveller, Burckhardt, remarks: "Since the Egyptian sycamore, among various other trees, will live many thousand years, there is nothing absurd in the supposition that the Virgin may have sat with the Infant Saviour under the shade of this noble trunk."³ Whether this be so or not, we are unable to give an authoritative reply, but we may more readily believe that it marks the same sacred spot.

About forty yards from the sycamore fig is the holy well, which we passed on our left as we came up the avenue of the garden. The "Gospel of the Infancy"⁴ tells how "the Lord Jesus brought forth a spring of water at Matariyeh, in which the Ladye Marye washed His raiment"; and the liturgical books of the venerable Coptic Church retain mention of that event. In their ecclesiastical calendar, called the "Synaxarium," the commemoration is marked for the 8th of the month Bauneh or Paoni, nearly equivalent to our 2d of June; and the "Dipnarion" recalls it in two canticles for the same day. The tradition is that our Lord brought forth this spring by His Almighty power, and that its waters remain ever sweet from having been in contact with His Divine Person. To us who come from lands where springs are numerous, it is difficult at first to realize why this one should be so remarkable as to countenance the fact of its being a fount of supernatural origin. Let us learn, therefore, if there be any grounds for this tradition, upon its natural side. The subsoil of Egypt consists of a salt sand, occasionally interrupted by beds of clay of small extent. The Nile's waters infiltrate this sandy soil, and

¹ Hasselquist, *Voyages*, p. 150.

² *Jerus. und des Heiligeland*, ii., 695.

³ *Egypt and Nubia*, i., 161.

⁴ Chap. xxiv.

form a continuous sheet of subterranean water, down into which the water pits are dug which we met with continually, such as that close to the obelisk within the walls of Heliopolis. The water raised by the sakyehs from these pits is of course excessively saline, and its supply depends upon the drainage of the district, varying also with the level of the river. This Fons Mariæ is entirely different; it is not dependent upon any such eventualities; its waters are beautifully sweet, and its supply constant. To the north, east, and west no spring exists in the land, and the only one south is that at Helonan, nearly twenty miles away, and is sulphurous, supplying the water-cure of the place. It, moreover, rises at the base of the Marattam hills, where the rainfall is more frequent, and from them it receives its waters. At Matariyeh, however, the country is flat, and the rainfall so small as scarcely to lay the dust, on the ten or twelve times a year of its occurrence. The spring is an alluvial soil, yet it remains free from all infiltration from the Nile, while all other sources at a similar distance from the river (five miles) are brackish. The natural fact stands, therefore, remarkable in itself, and well might pious tradition find the solution of it in the thought that it sprang forth to assuage the bodily thirst of its Creator, and retained its virtues from having bathed the limbs of Him who was the Son of God. Nor did the early Christians see anything incongruous in the fact that He whose touch could heal the sick, whose word could raise the dead, and the hem of whose garments could restore health to the poor woman in the crowd, should have possessed the power, and exercised it, of producing this spring when a little child in the Garden of Myrrh.

Sandys in his "Travels,"¹ remarks: "Of so many thousand wels (a thing most miraculous) this onely affordeth gustable waters; and that so excellent, that the Bassa refuseth the River to drinke thereof, and drinks of no other: and when they ceasse for anytime to exhaust it, it sendeth forth of itselfe so plentifull a streame, as able to turne an over-fall mill."

The ancient pilgrims love to tell how the very oxen which worked the water-wheel seemed to have been Christianized in their habits, retaining, even under their Arab masters, the custom they had learnt under their Coptic owners, no doubt, of suspending work from Saturday midday until sunrise on Monday. It amazed the early palmers to witness in a Moslem land what they almost thought to be the testimony of these dumb animals to the practice of abstaining from servile work upon the first day of the week, but perhaps the explanation is more welcome to us that the old acquired

¹ p. 127.

habits were not interfered with when the Saracen became the conqueror, for he seems to have retained the Christian gardeners. The Friar Brocard, who came here in 1283, would not credit the report about the animals desisting from work until, with his own eyes, he saw the fact;¹ and Quaresmius, an old "Guardian of the Holy Land," as the head of the Franciscans has even been called, says that very many persons testify to its truth.² Now, Arab workmen are employed, and black buffalos turn the two rôrias, which raise the hyaline stream, emptying it into a reservoir, from whence it flows to make glad this garden of God.

As we may readily believe, a spot with such memories as this was very unlikely to have been unmarked by a church in the six centuries before the birth of Mohammed, and although we cannot now see any remains of it above ground, yet we possess records which confirm its existence. Of such importance was it, that the commemoration of its dedication was deemed worthy of a place in the Coptic Synaxarium or Kalendar, which testifies to the extreme veneration in which it is held. On the 2d of June is marked, "The dedication of the Church of the Virgin Mother of God at Matariyeh, without the walls of Cairo, where the Virgin Mother, coming down to Egypt with her divine Son and her spouse, miraculously produced a spring of sweet waters"; and up to the present day they keep this festival, which is now called the "Feast of Balsam." On that day the Copts of Cairo, and all around, assemble at the village of Minich Sored, about two miles west of Matariyeh, upon the farther side of the Ismailia Canal, where two hundred or three hundred of them live. They pass one night in their church there, once celebrated for a miraculous picture of the Blessed Mary, and on the morrow, after hearing Mass, they come over to this garden and spend the day in happy enjoyment. The church here was in their keeping until the seventh century, when the Arabs came and turned them out; the sanctuary was stripped and defiled and afterwards converted into a mosque, which they called *Te Makādor* or *The Place of Repose*.³ The Arab historians tell the traditions of the place which they learned from the former owners, making the continuity very complete. The church stood about ten paces from the Holy Well, between the site of which and the spring the avenue now passes, and into it flowed the honored stream, filling a porphyry laver, and issuing again into the plantation.

An engraving of what stood of this ancient *ecclesia* in the sixteenth century may be seen in the work of Bernardin Amico (*Trattato delle piante e immagini de sacri edifizii di Terra Santa*, etc.), and in Corneille le Bruyn's "*Voyage du Levant*" there is another, taken

¹ *Salanieus*, x., 5.

² *Elucid. Terræ S.*

³ Wansleben, *Relation*, etc., p. 230.

about 1680, when the Dutch painter and traveller found it ruinous and desecrated. It appears to have been a plain rectangular room with an oblong lavacrum in the pavement, like to the Epiphany tanks which are seen in every Coptic church. In the former view a slab projects from the wall with a recess behind it, and it was perhaps the work of the Franciscan Fathers, who managed to obtain a concession of the spot in 1597, and by the alms of pious Venetian merchants to reline with precious marbles both laver and niche.¹ But their retention must have been very short-lived, for in 1610, when Sandys was there, he saw "a well environed with a poor mud wall, the water drawne up by buffalos into a small cesterne, from whence it ranne into a laver of marble within a small chappell, by the Moores (in contempt of Christians) spitefully defiled. In the wall there is a little concave lined with sweet wood (diminished by affectors of relicks) and smoked with incensis in the sole, a stone of porphyry, whereon (they say) she did set our Saviour." The writer regrets that upon his visits to Matariyeh he did not make closer search for any traces of this old church, but the thoughts aroused by the spot are so engrossing in their interest that he omitted to make any effort to discover any sign in the plantation which now covers its site. Even as late as 1755 its ruins were visible, as is shown by Fourmont in his "Description Historique," etc., as in 1714 by Paul Lucas.²

Once again, however, within the circuit of the garden, and not a hundred yards from the Holy Well and Tree, has arisen a Hill of Frankincense, and the eye is arrested and delighted as it approaches this spot by road, to see rising above its fresh and vivid green the sign of man's redemption and the statue of her who here bore her Holy Child in her arms. It is almost startling to come across this emblem and figure in this Moslem land, for although familiar to us throughout Europe, its rarity in this country is so great that its presence is welcomed like a message from home; and the faithful children of every family in divided Christendom must be grateful to the good men who have given us this joy in a land where all minor differences yield before the touchstone of Mahommed or Christ. The French Fathers of *La maison de la Sainte Famille*, in Cairo, have united here piety and patriotism; they have made at this resting-place of Jesus, Mary and Joseph a home for their own retreat when worn out with the fatigues of their toilsome lives in the great city, and they have raised their graceful little chapel above a rockwork grotto, recalling that of Lourdes in their own native country, connecting the spring and shrine in that western land with this in their eastern place of sojourn, testifying thus to

¹ A. Bassi, *Pellegrinaggio*.

² *Extrait d'un Voyage*, i., 309.

their belief that Christ's power and Mary's prayers are as real and potent in the nineteenth century as in the first. Moreover, they have combined to centre here the type of real conquest and true patriotism, for they have put their little oratory under the patronage of Notre Dame des Victoires, mindful of the victory of their country's arms over the Turk in the plains around; but with far higher meaning they set up this statue as their oriflamme, the standard of their queen, before whom, bearing her Son in her arms, the idols of Heliopolis fell, and its science paled into shadows of the truth. Once again, the memorial of that great Advent rises above the dust of that city's temples and the débris of its gods, and shall it not lead them to victory against the Moslem of this land, not to wrest from them their soil nor to enslave their bodies, but to captivate their minds and hearts and bring the princes of Arabia and Saba once more to the cradle of Bethlehem? Around their little house and chapel is a *hortus conclusus*, where the Fathers are endeavoring to gather the herbs and shrubs whose perfume and beauty, or importance as types in Holy Scripture, tell of the perfection of Mary's character. Palm and olive, rose and storax, plane and vine, sing here Ave Maria; and we hope that these Christian gardeners may get the balsam itself soon within their garden, reviving the historic culture of the spot and fulfilling the simile of the Canticles, "*Sicut Balsamum aromatizans odorem dedi: quasi Myrrha electa dedi suavitatem odoris.*"

It would never do for us to leave Matariyeh without considering what this Balsam was of which we have spoken so frequently, and which is the garden's title to-day. Josephus¹ tells us that, according to Jewish tradition, the first plant in Judæa was a present brought to King Solomon by the Queen of Sheba, and we know that there came to Jerusalem "no more such abundance of spices as" those she brought with her. This is exceedingly probable, for it is usually conceded that wherever Sheba may be, it lay south of Egypt, and we may remember that the kings of Ethiopia or Abyssinia claim a descent from her son. The myrrh or balsam trees of the land of Punt were considered so precious in early Egyptian history that we may see them figured upon the walls of that lovely temple of Deir el Baheir as being borne by Nubian slaves in tubs on the return of an expedition to that land, and it still grows in what we know as the Sûdan. It was also found by the wonderful traveller, Sir Richard Burton, between Mecca and Medinah, and Yakout, in 1228, says: "*J'ai bien ouï dire que l'arbuste du Hedjaz qu'on nomme Bescham est le même que le Baumier de Matariyeh, mais je ne sache pas que le Bescham donne du Baume.*"² *Bescham* is what Burton says is *Abouschâm* in El

¹ *Antiq.*, viii, 2.

Pays Inconnus, iv.

Hejaz, and he gathered from the Bedouins that the plant had been brought thither from Egypt, a fact which we should consider improbable. The Arabic name *Abouschâm*, *Bescham*, *Balisan* became the *Balsamon* of Theophrastus and Dioscorides; hence our Balsam further contracted into Balm. In the Sûdan we understand that it is called *Ayöut* or *Moyak*, but it is yet too unnoticed to have attracted our recent travellers. There evidently was balsam in the days of the patriarch Jacob in the Land of Gilead, for "a little balm" was one of the presents sent by him to his son Joseph in Egypt when they went thither to buy "corn." When the writer was travelling through that land in 1890 he made some effort to discover the shrub, but fruitlessly. It is quite possible, and seems probable, that this may have been of inferior quality to that of central Africa; perhaps it was the *Balsamo-dendron Gileadensis* Kunth. (*Amyris Gileadensis*, L.), of which a plant exists in the Royal Gardens of Kew; or it may have been exhausted when its value was learned and not replanted, after the manner of that desolated land. It existed in the days of the prophet Jeremias, as we shall see later on, and the phrase of the Balm of Gilead as a sovereign cure and sacred title remain to us still.

Solomon probably received as a gift plants of one species which grew here at Matariyeh, one *Balsamo-dendron Opobalsamum*, Kunth.; and would send it to be cherished in the warm valley of the Jordan, in the gardens of Engaddi, near Jericho, or to his "Enclosed Garden" among the hills of Bethlehem-Judah, and hence arose its other titles of Balm of Judah, Jericho, or Engaddi. And it is to these that perchance Pliny refers¹ when he says: "Of all perfumes, the best is that of the balm produced by the land of Judæa alone. Formerly it only grew in two gardens, both of them royal. The Emperors Vespasian and Titus have exhibited this shrub in Rome. Glorious to say, since Pompey the Great we have carried trees even in our triumphs. Now this tree is a captive and pays tribute with its nation." Some attribute its introduction into Matariyeh to Cleopatra, who sent a commission to Engaddi to obtain a plant, but to the early Christians its presence seemed linked with Him from whom all sweetness flows, and to their simple minds it was more pleasant to think that it sprang up from the drops of His sweat as he played in the garden's walks, or from the water wherein His blessed Mother laved His limbs or washed His linen. Even so great a commentator as Cornelius a Lapide² seems to see in its coming here, about the time of the Holy Family's arrival, a striking figure and realization of the words: "I gave forth my odor like sweet balsam . . . and my fragrance like pure myrrh"; and the ancient tradition we may find transferred across

¹ *Hist. Nat.*, xii., 25, 54.

² *Ecclus.*, xxiv., 20, 21.

Europe to our own shores in connection with the Libanotis, frankincense, or Rosemary bush, which is said to gain all its perfume from having borne upon it the clothes of the Redeemer.

The life of the trees here seems to have been very precarious from the fourteenth century. The noble German pilgrims, whose visit is told by Bernard de Breidenbach, speak of seeing five hundred trees, but these had dwindled down to a solitary specimen in 1615, and this was destroyed by an excessive inundation of the Nile. Felix Faber, in his "Evagatorium," describes the shrub as scarcely a man's height, like a gooseberry somewhat in appearance, with whitish branches and leaves resembling those of rue, but seven foiled, and many of the old pilgrims tell of the method of extracting its soft gum. The choicest and earliest was obtained by making incisions during the hot months, and the exudation was collected in glass vases. It was of the consistency of honey, and of a yellowish-brown color, and reserved most jealously by the Soldan for gifts to such mighty and mysterious potentates as Prester John, Negus of Ethiopia, the Cham of Tartary, the Caliph of Bagdad, and so forth. It was believed by the Arabs not to flourish unless it were tended by Christian hands and watered by Our Lady's Spring, and several attempts to contravene this are recorded. Almelec-Alcamel, the Caliph, obtained leave from his father Adel to plant some of the shrubs in a neighboring garden, but they would not grow until the water of Sitti Mariam was brought to them,¹ and in 1195 a Jew, Ibn Koreita, afterwards Vizier to Sultan Aziz, son of the great Salah Ed-din, made a similar attempt, and his incredulity was removed.²

The tonic and stomachic properties which the shrub possesses, and the rareness of its growth made popular imagination extend its virtues until it seemed to satisfy that search of eastern pharmacy—the elixir of life itself. Maundeville tells how it was considered an infallible specific in fifty different complaints, and it is to these medicinal qualities that the prophet refers who wrote his lamentations at the city of Heliopolis, just without this Matariyeh garden's pale, distraught by the "cry of the daughter of (his) people that dwell in the land far" from the fair hill of Zion which they have forsaken. He exclaims, "Is there no balm in Gilead, no physician there?"³ and exhorts them to return and "go up into Gilead and take of its balsam, O virgin, the daughter of Egypt; for in vain shalt thou use many medicines, for no cure shall be unto thee here."⁴

With such a reputation we can easily appreciate how prized

¹ De Saey's translation of *Abd-Allatif*, p. 90.

² Wansleben, *Hist. de l'Eglise Alex.*, ii., 25.

³ Jer., viii., 19.

⁴ Jer., xlv., 11.

every drop must have been, and few shrubs can trace such an ancestry of esteem through the Pharaohs, the Jews, the Romans and the Arabs. We might include the Christians also, since for many centuries it was sought to provide the precious unguent used in the Church called the Holy Chrism, which is employed at baptism, confirmation, ordination of priests and dedication of churches and altars. Chrism is but the Greek for a very thick anointing substance; we have the word softened into "cream," and a "chrisome-child" is one upon whose brow the anointing at baptism still remains covered by the linen bandage or "chrisome-cloth" about his head. Myrrh is but another Greek word for the same medium, and because this chrism was in early time the gum from the balsam trees of Matariyeh and Engaddi the word myrrh became identical with balm. The ceremony of consecrating the Holy Chrism takes place every Holy Saturday in Catholic Churches, the day the "Three Myrrhophores," or myrrh bearers, as the Eastern Church calls the three Marys, went to the Sepulchre to anoint the body of the Lord. Among the Copts of Egypt it is consecrated at the monastery of St. Macarius on Good Friday from the same allusion, and they compose it of those aromatics which were found in the Sepulchre of the Saviour; Wansleben gives the drugs which they employ and the manner of their preparation. The Catholic Church has had to substitute for the balsam from the Garden of the Repose in Egypt that of species in Peru, sold as Balm of Mecca, which mingled with spices forms the *oleum chrismatum* in her triple chrismatories. There is a tale told of St. Willebald, a Briton, who was bishop in Bavaria, that having made a pilgrimage to the Holy Land in A.D. 723, he managed to obtain a gourd full of the much sought for Balsam in Jerusalem, whether it was that of Matariyeh, the record does not say; but if it were from Solomon's gardens then this is the latest record we have of the plants there. Having obtained his treasure the difficulty was to escape with his life, for strangers were in a continual state of being searched and this balm had a most potent fragrance. At last the bishop obtained a rag soaked with petroleum (*petræ oleo*) and with this for stopper he was able to evade the custom house scrutiny (Hodæporicon S. Willebaldi. Trin.). De Sacy in his notes on the Arab writes, Abd Allatif says: "Le souverains Chrétiens le recherchent à l'envi les uns des autres, et tous les Chrétiens, en général, l'ont en grand estime; ils ne croient point qu'un Chrétien soit devenu parfait Chrétien, si l'on ne met un peu d'huile de Baume dans l'eau Baptismale, quand on l'y plonge." Shakespeare has given us the proverb: "Not all the water in the rough rude sea, can wash the balm from an anointed king," and each country in Europe had a tradition of the miraculous origin of this coronation

balm. In England it was said that the Blessed Mother of God had given a golden eagle filled with the holy oil to St. Thomas of Canterbury, during his exile, with the promise that any kings of England anointed with it would be merciful rulers and champions of Holy Church.¹ In which we can trace the origin of the Balsam from Mary's Garden. The same sort of story is that of the dove with the crystal ampulla bringing the balm for Clovis's consecration at Rheims; but we have said enough to show how great a part the shrub's produce occupied in the Christian economy.

Let us now take one last turn round the walks of Matariyeh before we leave and complete some detail of thought. It is in this place of the Repose that painters and sculptors often represent the young Child Jesus with a bird in His hand; a picture by Fra Angelico in Lord Dudley's late sale made it yellow and long-headed and with an aureole apparently, while in the other hand our Lord held what looked like a banana or perhaps it was a roll of clay; another at same sale by Fra Bartolomeo made it a small black bird, while in a third by Francesco Francia it looked like a brown sparrow. A chaffinch, a nightingale, a redbreast, in fact any bird was employed by the painters to tell a legend which we have never seen given, the usual explanation being that it is but a plaything. In those pictures—as in that by Lorenzo di Credi in the Palace Pitti, at Florence—where the scene is that of the Nativity and the Saviour lies on the ground or manger with a bird by his side—there is no connection with this Matariyeh scene but the reference is to quite another legend; that of which we are now speaking is a story told in the Apocryphal Gospels where it is related that our Lord and some other Jewish children were at play, amusing themselves by making models of birds in moist earth; when they tired they threw them up in the air in sportive recklessness, but those which had been fashioned by the hand of the Creator became endowed with life and soared into the heavens.² Hence flow numerous charming legends about birds, which still remain to us in quiet parts of Europe as also in Asia, in allusion to this miracle. The swallow has a sacred name in every Christian land, as the "Bird of God," or the "Virgin Mary's Fowl," and A. de Latrope in his "*Gazophilacium linguæ Persarum*"³ says that the Arabs called it the "Bird of Jesus," as if to identify it with the story. In other lands, the blue titmouse is entitled "*Le fils de Dieu*," and forever chaunts His name; and the Sicilian loves the "*Figliuolo di Dio*." Others again, would ally the story to the golden plover, whose "*deerrin*" note sounds like a Scandinavian word said to

¹ *Maskell*, iii., p. 17.

² *Thilo*, cxi., p. 284; B. H. Cooper, p. 32.

³ 1684, p. 356.

mean "glory" (dyrdhin); and we might carry on the pretty guesses made by simple hearts and ears in early days to much greater lengths. Didron tells us¹ that a group may be seen in stone in the church of Vertus (Marne), of the thirteenth century, but he does not read its meaning, we suggest, as the correct one; he thinks it only a plaything, as any object might be, just as others would see the Holy Dove in similar sculptures in the hospice of Rue Sommis, in the church of St. Germain-des-Près, in Paris, or in the painting of the Madonna of Guercino. Mrs. Jameson thought that the bird in the Saviour's hand was borrowed from the Egyptian hieroglyphics, and that, in some way, it referred to the soul of man; indeed, she was confident that this was so in the very ancient pictures. But, in early days, as we have said already, these legends of the Sacred infancy were very familiarly known and popularly held as facts; and although, in later times, birds were introduced only as ornamental accessories, yet, in the Eastern parrot-like figures, or, as is frequent in the Venetian pictures, the partridge, or, in Raphael's famous goldfinch (Madonna del Cardellino), the originating idea was this story from the Garden of Balsam. So forgotten were these old legends, as men began to disregard the sacredness of nature, and to look upon its beautiful denizens for purposes of "sport," or as dainties for the stomach—returning to the basest of pagan bestialities in destroying the sweet birds of heaven for a fragmentary, unneedful food—that we find all the proprieties of art set aside, and Baroccio can dare to paint our Blessed Lord holding up a bird before a cat, and calmly depict there the cruelty and infidelity that must have saturated his own soul.

We might make reflections upon most of the trees which grow in this garden, for almost all of them are allied to sacred traditions. There is one we must not omit, since it is closely interwoven with early art, and takes its source probably from another of those apocryphal gospels, viz., that of the Nativity of Mary. An old crusading bishop of Acre, in 1244, says: "At Cairo is a very ancient date tree, which spontaneously bent itself to the Blessed Virgin when she wished to eat of its fruit"; and a traveller, in 1672, relates how, "eating some dates with an old man, but credulous Christian, he said, 'that the letter O remained on a date-stone for a remembrance that our Blessed Lady, the Virgin, with her divine Babe in her arms, resting herself at the foot of a palm tree (which inclined its branches and offered a cluster of dates to its Creator), plucked some of the dates, and eating them, satisfied with the taste and flavor, cried out in amazement, 'O, how sweet they are!' This exclamation engraved the letter O, the first word

¹ Bohn's edit., i., 490.

of her speech, upon the date-stone, which being very hard preserved it.” In painting or mosaic, this bowing of the palm tree is of frequent reference, as in the fresco of Pinturicchio, at St. Onofrio, Rome ; and it is another of the legends popular in mediæval times which took their origin from the Repose of the Holy Family in Egypt.

We here reluctantly must end. In these traditional stories there is one continual charm in the simplicity of the minds which connected all they saw in nature with the life of our Blessed Lord upon earth, and that of His saints ; the tender piety with which they expressed their observations on all vegetable and other forms of life, evince dispositions which it would be well if we still possessed ; and, in our adoration for what we call scientific knowledge, we should not dismiss that which clothes the skeleton of fact with the beauty of imagination. It may be true that the stars shine, but we should recognize, primarily, that they twinkle, and that they are set in the firmament of heaven by One who “callesth them all by their names.” It may be that the herb of the field is a gasometer, but the essential truth is, that God has clothed it with virtue and beauty. Amongst those, too, who will frankly profess a certainty of belief in the miracles recorded in the New Testament, why should there be the keen antipathy to quietly listen to even the probability of any others, such as we have here related, even among Catholics ? Their rejection incurs no spiritual censure ; and those who accept the miracle of converting water into wine, need not become impatient at being asked to listen to the sweetening of the Matariyeh spring. If we cannot trace the Repose in Egypt by historical writings, it seems worth while to attempt to do so by the legends which remain to us, and by the traditions which art has preserved and illustrated. Of course, in these days, when we are taught to scornfully turn from all antiquity as the time of superstition and ignorance, we are in no mental touch with those days when books were unknown, and all history was but the handing on of facts from father to son ; and the insolent daring of modern talk in arguing over the fact of the world’s ever needing a Creator, far less a Redeemer, drives us apart from every period of thought that has ever existed. But still, to many, there continues a reverence for the past ages, and a wistfulness for the peaceful faith they knew—and to such, this record may be sympathetic, while they stay in the impressive land of Egypt and think of the residence there of their Saviour and their God when, as a boy, “Jesus was here among men.”

A. R. DOWLING.

OUR CONVERTS.

PART II.

THE next eminent convert was Mrs. Eliza A. Seton, of New York, whose case, like that of the others I have related, proves that God frequently selects those outside the Church to be the bearers of great missions in the Church. Mrs. Seton was a type of Christian womanhood. Her life, in disaster as well as in prosperity, was a model of Christian grace. The wife of William Seton, a wealthy merchant, when commercial and financial disaster swept away the fortune of a life's accumulation, her fortitude strengthened with adversities. When her husband's health gave way under the pressure, she accompanied him to the more congenial climate of Italy, where her vigils, her nursing and her angelic ministrations prolonged, but did not save, the life she so much cherished. In Italy she saw the Church, but it was at a distance; her misfortunes, her poverty, her exile, her bereavement made her pure soul conscious of a spiritual void. Faith and grace and communion with God she now sought. She returned to New York, her home. Her former spiritual advisers, Bishop Hobart and other Protestant ministers, used every effort to meet the needs of this noble nature, but in vain. Her spirit, however, did not rest until it found truth and light and grace and peace in the ancient and apostolic Church, which came down, directly through the ages, from the Saviour to all times. The circumstances of Mrs. Seton's conversion were most interesting and touching. She was received into the Catholic Church March 14, 1805. Among the eminent Catholic divines who took part in presenting the truths of religion to her were Archbishop Carroll, of Baltimore; Bishop Cheverus, of Boston; Rev. Dr. Dubourg, Rev. Dr. Matignon and others. Now her heart was filled with a desire to do good—the project of some great work of charity occupied her thoughts, and from an academy for young ladies, which she started in Baltimore, her thoughts and aspirations developed into the grandest and most beneficent results—the founding of the American Sisterhood of Charity. What higher mission, what holier result, are human efforts and sacrifices capable of? In the higher academies of our land, in the humble parochial schools, in hospitals, asylums and infirmaries, on the field of battle and in epidemics and pestilence, the daughters of Mother Seton, Sisters of Charity, have won the plaudits of good men, and, by their holy works, have carried the battlements of heaven!

Fanny Allen was one of Vermont's fairest daughters—still fairer and more beautiful in intellect and in soul. She was the youngest daughter of Vermont's Revolutionary hero, General Ethan Allen. Educated in such manner as to meet the natural gifts of her mind, religion was excluded from her training, but it welled up in her soul by a grace that came only from above. Her questions were parried by her family, but never answered. She was born on February 16, 1784. While still receiving her education at the hands of a devoted step-father, she was led by an unknown impulse to the temple of a religion of which she knew almost nothing. From that moment, in her heart, she became a Catholic in faith. It was her own secret. She received baptism, at the age of twenty-two, at the hands of Rev. Daniel Barber, whose name has already been mentioned, and will be mentioned more fully, as an eminent convert; but at this time he was a Protestant minister. She soon afterwards, with her parents' consent, went to Montreal, to study French, and became a pupil in the Convent School of the Sisters of the Congregation. Her conversion was sudden; it took place at the gate of the sanctuary railing in the convent chapel, whither a sister had sent her to place a vase of flowers before the Blessed Sacrament. Her steps were mysteriously arrested at the gate; three times she attempted to fulfill her mission, and three times she was stopped by an inscrutable impulse:

"Ter limen tetigi, ter sum revocatus!"

Was she, without an open profession of faith, unworthy to approach the Holy of Holies? She fell upon her knees and adored Jesus Christ in the Holy Eucharist. Retiring to an obscure corner of the temple, she wept, and when her voice returned to her, she exclaimed, "After this miraculous occurrence, I must give myself to my Saviour." The tidings of her conversion produced intense sensation in her family and in all Vermont. She was brought by her parents to their home in Sheldon, Vermont, where the allurements of gay and fashionable society and all the means to which her parents could resort were used to change her purpose; but in the end her mother accompanied her again on a second visit to the convent at Montreal. But she took time even then, and had recourse to prayer before making a selection among the many admirable religious orders of Montreal. Finally she entered the Hotel Dieu. She was professed in 1810, her parents attending amid the concourse of people attracted to the chapel. Her parents frequently visited her. Her convent life was a model of the true religious. Her physician, an American Protestant, was so impressed by her heroic death that he became converted on the spot. She died on December 10, 1819. We shall soon see

cause for wonder at the many remarkable conversions which followed hers in Vermont.

Remarkable indeed was the conversion of the Barber family. Rev. Daniel Barber had served two terms as a soldier in the Revolutionary War. He belonged to a large, intellectual and influential family, and his father, whose name was Daniel, had become impoverished by the war of our independence and the depreciation of paper money. He was born in Connecticut on October 2, 1756. Reared in the strictest school of Congregationalism, his earnest mind, in search of the Apostolic succession, led him to join the Episcopal Church, and at the age of thirty he was a minister therein, which was about the year 1786. During thirty-two years of Episcopal ministry, his mind was in spirit Catholic; but little was known in Vermont of the Catholic Church. He would make the sign of the cross, and he deemed nothing unworthy of a Christian which honored Christ. He was present at the religious profession of Fanny Allen at Montreal in 1810, and was deeply impressed by her heroic faith. In 1812 he visited Bishop Cheverus at Boston. Many difficulties presented themselves to his mind, and he communicated to his son, Rev. Virgil Horace Barber, then an Episcopal minister in Northern New York, his doubts, and lent him the books on Catholic doctrine which he was reading. In 1816 Virgil Horace Barber met Rev. Benedict Joseph Fenwick at New York, and feeling greatly disturbed in his faith, he communicated to him his own doubts and difficulties. He was already married and had a large family. He was a man of fine education and culture. He and his wife, under the instruction and kind advice of Dr. Fenwick, but under circumstances of appalling sacrifice, became Catholics, and all their children followed. Daniel Barber, his father, though yet not wholly converted or over his scruples, was at all times honest in his convictions, and he earnestly desired to know the truth and to embrace it. Such was his scrupulosity in changing his religion a second time, and such his desire for study and light, that not only did his son, Virgil Horace, and all his family precede him in entering the Church, but so also did his own wife and other relatives in Vermont. Finally, he, who had led so many others to investigate and embrace the truth, saw its full effulgence himself, and on November 15, 1818, he resigned his Episcopalian parish, and delivered a farewell address to the congregation. He then went to visit his friends in the South, and while there he was received into the Church at Georgetown, where his son, Virgil Horace, who had joined the Society of Jesus, was making his novitiate. I must now go back a little in my narrative. Such were the sentiments of gratitude to God of Mr. and Mrs. Virgil Horace Barber, for the grace of conversion, that each

desired to make an entire sacrifice of their lives to religion; but how could husband and wife be separated, and be received into the ecclesiastical and religious state? They consulted their friend, Rev. Benedict Joseph Fenwick, of the Society of Jesus, and he informed them that by their mutual consent and the permission of the Sovereign Pontiff, this could be done; and he cited the case of Lord and Lady Warner, in England, who became converts, and, after making provision for their children, Lord Warner was received into the Society of Jesus, while she took the veil in a convent on the continent. It would be extremely interesting to relate the details of this remarkable history, but time and space are not sufficient. The requisite permission and arrangements having been made, the Rev. Virgil Horace Barber was received into the Society of Jesus, made his novitiate at Georgetown College, and after completing his studies partly at Rome, was ordained a priest in the Society of Jesus in 1822. With the permission of his Superiors in the Society, he was sent to Claremont, the home of the Barbers, to serve as a missionary priest, where he built a church, and announced with fervor and effect the truths he had himself embraced. His wife, Mrs. Jerusha Barber, became a Visitation nun, under the religious name of Sister Mary St. Augustin, at Georgetown Convent. All the children of Mr. and Mrs. Virgil Horace Barber became members of religious orders. Their oldest child, Mary Barber, became an Ursuline nun at Quebec, under the religious name of Sister Mary Benedicta. Mary Abigail Barber also became an Ursuline nun in the same convent at Quebec. Susan Barber became an Ursuline nun in the convent of that order at Three Rivers, Canada. Josephine Barber became a Visitation nun in the convent of that order at Mobile, Alabama. The only son of Mr. and Mrs. Barber became a Jesuit priest, and few students of Georgetown College have not heard of the saintly life of the good and learned Rev. Samuel Barber, S. J. The mother and four daughters remained faithful and devout nuns to the last, and edified their respective sisterhoods by their sanctity, their religious obedience and their angelic virtues. It was the singular fortune of the present writer to have known and seen personally and frequently these three celebrated convert priests, Daniel Barber, Virgil Horace Barber and Samuel Barber. The Rev. Daniel Barber often visited my father's house in Washington while I was a child; he was a great invalid, but in the midst of his severe paroxysms of pain I could hear him devoutly reciting the rosary. Whenever he arrived at my father's house, the whole family venerated him as a saint, and the utmost kindness was shown to him. As a boy, I rejoiced to hear him relate his services in the Revolutionary War, in which my own grandfather was an officer under Washington,

and his experience in the long struggle he made to reach and embrace the truth of revelation. The Rev. Virgil Horace and Rev. Samuel Barber were preceptors of mine at Georgetown College from 1844 to 1848, the former as Catechist and teacher of Christian Doctrine, and the latter as professor of Classics. Both were learned men, but both were even more devout than learned. I shall never forget the edification I experienced at seeing the Rev. Father Virgil Horace Barber going to confession to his own son, the Rev. Samuel. He called his own son "Father Samuel," and I remember this venerable priest often asking me to go and send "Father Samuel" to him. The conversion of the Barber family led also directly, or at least indirectly, to the conversion of Mrs. Tyler, sister of Rev. Virgil Horace Barber, also of his nephew, William Tyler, who afterwards became a priest and the first Bishop of Hartford, and to the conversions of Rev. Mr. Kewley, Rev. Mr. Ironside, Rev. Colvin White and several others. In its widespread consequences and fruits, in leading to other conversions, the conversion of the Barber family had more features of a movement in it than any phase of the convert question up to this time except the Mercersburg movement; and yet there is more individuality in all these conversions than is to be found among most of the English converts of the Oxford movement.

While Napoleon was in the zenith of his imperial power, an order which he issued, that all Englishmen, then in France, should be regarded as prisoners, arrested the homeward journey of a young English gentleman accompanied by his mother, and his detention in France brought him to the light and membership of the Catholic Church. A French Abbé, at Lyons, was his friend, associate, and instructor, in the faith. What could have been more unique and providential than the results? Both the French Abbé and the young English convert afterwards became American archbishops. The Abbé of Lyons was afterwards Archbishop Maréchal, and the young English convert became Archbishop Whitfield.

Rev. James Whitfield, born at Liverpool, 1770, was ordained at Lyons in 1809. When Metropolitan of Baltimore, Archbishop Maréchal invited Father Whitfield from England to America; the latter arrived at Baltimore in 1817. In 1828, Dr. Whitfield was appointed coadjutor bishop; before the bulls arrived, Archbishop Maréchal was dead; and, on May 25, 1828, Bishop Flaget consecrated Dr. Whitfield fourth Archbishop of Baltimore. He devoted his large private fortune to the cause of religion, education, and charity; he obtained large donations for the same cause from the Association for the Propagation of the Faith; he generously assisted the poor and scattered Catholics of Richmond and Norfolk. He has the eminent distinction of assembling the first Provincial

Council of Baltimore, which embraced all the bishops of the United States, in 1829. He did much from his private means towards completing the beautiful Cathedral of Baltimore. In 1833, he called the second Provincial Council of all the bishops of the United States, over which he ably presided. He was a great friend and patron of religious orders, which increased greatly under his administration. Archbishop Whitfield died on October 19, 1834, deeply regretted and revered in America and Europe.

Descended from an ancient English family, the marriage of his widowed mother to a Catholic gentleman of Maryland, led the way to the conversion of Samuel Eccleston, who was born in 1801. Converted while a student of St. Mary's College, Baltimore, he entered the Theological Seminary in 1819, and was ordained a priest in 1825. Not content with such studies as America then afforded, he went to France, England, and Ireland; returned to America in 1827, and was appointed president of his Alma Mater, St. Mary's. In 1834, he was appointed coadjutor bishop, and was consecrated by Archbishop Whitfield, and, on October 19th of that year, on the death of Dr. Whitfield, he became fifth Archbishop of Baltimore, at the early age of thirty-three. His administration, like that of Dr. Whitfield, was a model one. He introduced the Brothers of St. Patrick in his archdiocese; he introduced the first Redemptorists into the United States; he introduced the Lazarists into his archdiocese; and, besides many new churches, Mt. Hope Hospital for the Insane was built under his administration. The Young Catholic's Friend Society, and St. Charles College near Ellicott's Mills, were established during his administration; he called together, and presided over, five Provincial Councils of Baltimore. In 1833, eight bishops attended the Third Provincial Council; in 1840, thirteen bishops attended the Fourth; in 1843, sixteen bishops attended the Fifth; in 1846, twenty-three bishops attended the Sixth; in 1849, twenty-five bishops attended the Seventh. In 1846, Archbishop Eccleston introduced the first Christian Brothers into America. To have introduced the first Redemptorists and the first Christian Brothers into this country, entitles this eminent convert to the undying gratitude of the American Church.

I have already alluded to the conversion of Bishop Tyler, nephew of Rev. Virgil Horace Barber, as soon following that of his uncle, and of his mother, and other relatives of Vermont and New Hampshire. Young Tyler became a fine classical scholar under the instruction of his uncle; he made his theological studies in Boston, under Bishop Fenwick, and in Montreal, and was ordained by Dr. Fenwick at Pentecost, 1828. So holy and zealous was his priesthood, that when the Fifth Council of Balti-

more, in 1843, erected Hartford into an episcopal see, Father Tyler was appointed its first bishop; he was consecrated at Baltimore, by Bishop Fenwick, on March 17, 1844. Holy Trinity Church became his cathedral, the only church in Hartford, and it was then a poor cathedral; his diocese had but six priests; and, in order to reach a greater number of Catholics, he made Providence his residence. Such was the poverty of the diocese, that he had to obtain pecuniary aid from the Leopoldine Society at Vienna. He attended the Sixth and Seventh Councils of Baltimore. At the time of his consecration he caught a severe cold, from which he never recovered. His labors and trials were great, for, not only had he to struggle against poverty and ill-health, but the prejudice of all New England, and especially of Connecticut and Rhode Island, were against him and his cause. At the Seventh Council he presented medical certificates that he could not survive much longer, and requested permission to resign; the Council preferred to give him a coadjutor, Right Rev. Dr. O'Reilly; but after his return from the Council, while still struggling to offer the immaculate sacrifice, he was taken ill at the altar, and was held up while proceeding with his last Mass. He died on June 18, 1849. In the midst of his impoverished circumstances, Bishop Tyler succeeded in adding considerably to the churches and works of the diocese, and he died a faithful witness to the faith he had embraced so heroically.

Descended from the Youngs on his father's side and the Moodys on his mother's side, both old English families, which gave many ministers to Universalism and Congregationalism in New England, Joshua Moody Young was a thorough Puritan. Born in Maine, in 1808, he learned the printing trade, and thus made the acquaintance of a young Catholic boy, whose conversations paved the way to his conversion from Universalism to Catholicity. His conversion was completed under Bishop Fenwick, and, in 1828, he received conditional baptism from that celebrated convert Father Charles D. Ffrench, at Portland. In baptism he took the name of Mary as his middle name. In 1830 he removed to the West, entered the diocese of Cincinnati, and worked as a printer on the *Catholic Telegraph*. Bishop Purcell sent him to Mt. St. Mary's College, in Maryland; he embraced the sacerdotal state, and was ordained in 1837. He devoted himself to the arduous mission of the West, and from 1837 to 1854 Father Young spent his life in travelling, preaching, instructing, and leading souls to the truth. In 1854 the episcopal See of Erie was created, and Father Young was made its first bishop. The most strenuous efforts on his part failed to secure his escape from the mitre, and he was consecrated by Archbishop Purcell, at Cincinnati, on April 23, 1854. Such

was the poverty of the new diocese, that his former parishioners, at Lancaster, Ohio, presented him with a handsome donation to aid in organizing it and as a tribute to his apostolic labors among them. Bishop Young was an example of Catholic piety and self-denial. He was austere to himself, loved retirement, practiced austerities, was devoted to labor and study, an early riser, a devout client of Mary, was hospitable to poor members of the clergy, full of deeds of charity to his neighbor and to the orphans, a promoter of education, a great church-builder. In the first year of his episcopate there were twenty-eight churches in the Diocese of Erie, and these he increased to more than fifty; and he increased its priests from fourteen to fifty-one. He travelled much through his diocese, erected schools and academies. He was an example of self-sacrifice, labor and zeal. He worked until he died, in the service of his Master, and died suddenly, on September 18, 1866.

The conversion of the Rev. James Roosevelt Bayley was one of the most heroic and edifying events in the history of our converts. He was descended from an old English family; he also had the blood of the Huguenot Le Comptes in his veins, and on his mother's side he was descended from the Knickerbocker Roosevelts. His American ancestors were prominent and useful citizens of New York, and his father, Dr. Guy Carlton Bayley, was an eminent physician. He was a nephew of Mother Seton, the illustrious foundress of the American Sisters of Charity. In 1839 he was rector of St. Andrew's Episcopal Church, at Harlem, New York, and it was then he made the acquaintance and loved the conversations of a young, devout and learned Catholic priest, and thus were sowed the first seeds of the faith; this young priest was afterwards the first American cardinal, John McCloskey. He resigned St. Andrew's rectorship even before he became a Catholic, and went to Europe in 1841; at Rome he visited the Episcopal Church and received Communion therein; and here, too, at Rome, he met Cardinal Cullen, the Jesuit Father Esmund, and Father Haskins, an American convert. He made a spiritual retreat at the Gesu, under Father Esmund, was received into the Catholic Church, and on April 28, 1842, he received Holy Communion and confirmation at the chapel of St. Ignatius from the hands of Cardinal Franzoni. He continued his travels, opened a correspondence with Archbishop Hughes, and finally commenced the study of Catholic theology at St. Sulpice, Paris, where Father Lynden and Archbishop Williams, of Boston, were among his companions. After a year he was visited at St. Sulpice by Archbishop Hughes, under whose jurisdiction he placed himself. After returning to New York and continuing his studies at St. John's, Fordham, he was ordained by Dr. Hughes, on March 2, 1843. Father Bayley served as Vice-

President of St. John's College, performed missionary work, in 1846 became secretary to Archbishop Hughes, then his chancellor, and was eminently able, zealous and energetic. He thoroughly organized the New York Chancery Office. Under his grandfather's will he forfeited his inheritance of \$70,000 by becoming a Catholic, and when he heard of the decision of the court against him, he expressed his resignation by saying: "It will be all the same a hundred years hence." In 1853, when the Diocese of Newark was erected, he was appointed its first bishop, and was consecrated at old St. Patrick's, New York, by Archbishop Hughes on October 30, 1852, together with Bishops Loughlin and De Goesbriand. Under his administration, Seton Hall College was founded, St. Elizabeth's Convent and Academy at Madison established, and also orphan asylums at Newark, Paterson and Jersey City. He introduced the Benedictines, the Passionists, the Christian Brothers, the Sisters of Notre Dame, and the Sisters of the Poor of St. Francis. He was a champion of temperance and a public opponent of Know-Nothingism. In 1872 he succeeded Most Rev. Martin John Spaulding as Archbishop of Baltimore. His short administration at Baltimore was energetic, zealous and fruitful, even though his health was infirm. He succeeded in getting the cathedral out of debt and consecrated, and made visitations of his archdiocese. It was during his administration that the Archdiocese of Philadelphia and its suffragans were separated from the Province of Baltimore. He was appointed by Pope Pius IX. to place the red beretta on the head of Cardinal McCloskey. His health grew so infirm that he went to Europe for medical aid and rest, but returned in a dying state, and was unable to reach Baltimore. He died at his old residence at Newark on October 3, 1877.

General William Starke Rosecrans was born in Ohio, in 1819, graduated at West Point in 1842, was professor at West Point of natural and experimental philosophy and engineering, and, while thus engaged at the Military Academy, he studied and reasoned himself, guided by divine grace, into the Catholic Church. His conversion led to that of his brother, to whom he communicated the reasons for his change of religion. After serving in many capacities in military and civic employments, when the Civil War broke out, in 1861, he went into the volunteer service and rose to the highest military rank by his brilliant and dauntless services in important campaigns, and was the hero of many battle-fields. His military education, his skill in theoretical and practical science and in the art of war, and his ardent patriotism, made him one of the foremost generals of the war. So long and varied were his services that it would be impossible to give the details of his campaigns.

He received several public votes of thanks for his gallantry and skill. After the war he served in Congress, and was prominently engaged with many public measures, such as the railroad between the United States and Mexico, mining operations and railroads; and in 1885 he was appointed Register of the United States Treasury. General Rosecrans is a man of marked ability and character, and while he has contributed important papers on the historical questions growing out of the war, several works have been written on his principal campaigns.

Right Rev. Sylvester Horton Rosecrans was a brother of General Rosecrans. While at the Episcopalian College of Kenyon, Ohio, a letter which he received from his distinguished brother, General Rosecrans, who had become a Catholic, drew his attention to the reasons in favor of Catholic truth, and he was received into the Church in 1845. His faith and zeal were great, for Bishop Lamy, then a missionary in Ohio, mentioned that the young convert walked frequently eight miles, while fasting, to Mt. Vernon, Ohio, to receive Holy Communion. From Kenyon he went to St. John's, at Fordham, and thence to the Roman Propaganda. He won the doctor's cap, and was ordained at Rome in 1852. In the midst of several missionary labors his arduous studies made him a thorough schoolman and theologian. His sermons were clear, logical, and convincing. He became coadjutor bishop to Archbishop Purcell in 1862, and in 1868 he was appointed first Bishop of Columbus. His labors were constant and untiring, his works resulted in increasing the churches and institutions of his diocese, and his personal virtues made him a model for the imitation of his clergy. His poverty was in keeping with his personal sacrifices for religion and charity. He was indifferent to fame and seldom left his diocese. After so many labors he devoted himself finally to the erection of the Cathedral of Columbus, and so great were his labors, anxieties, and fatigues, that in the midst of the dedication services, on October 20, 1878, he was prostrated and died in a few hours. Such was his voluntary poverty, and charity to the poor, that at his death two silver dollars constituted all his worldly wealth.

Though born in Philadelphia, in 1813, James Frederick Wood, who became the first archbishop of that diocese, spent the earlier part of his manhood at Cincinnati, where he served in responsible positions from check-clerk to cashier in one of the largest banks of that city. He was descended from a good English family of Gloucestershire. His family and himself were Protestants. The reasonings of his clear, methodical, and logical mind, aided by grace, led him to embrace the Catholic faith, and he was received into the Church by Archbishop Purcell on April 7, 1836. Re-

signing his position in the bank, he gave himself to the holy priesthood, studied theology at the Roman Propaganda, where his fine executive abilities and religious character caused him to be appointed Prefect of Discipline. He was a thorough theologian and canonist, and was ordained by Cardinal Franzoni on March 25, 1844. He performed parochial missionary work at the Cincinnati Cathedral, from 1844 to 1857, with signal ability and zeal, and in the latter year was appointed Coadjutor Bishop of Philadelphia in consequence of the declining health of the saintly and learned Bishop Neumann, and, in 1860, he succeeded as fifth Bishop of Philadelphia. His labors now were exceedingly great, for his diocese included all Eastern Pennsylvania and Delaware and West New Jersey. He restored the depressed finances of the diocese to prosperity; he completed Philadelphia's magnificent Cathedral; he was a friend and companion of the orphans and of the poor; he erected the great Ecclesiastical Seminary of St. Charles Borromeo. It would be difficult to enumerate the institutions enlarged by him, or those which he founded or befriended for purposes of education and charity. His business training and experience were so beneficial to his diocese as to demonstrate the importance of suitable and adequate business training for the American clergy who have to manage such vast temporal interests. On February 15, 1875, Philadelphia became a Metropolitan See, with the dioceses of Pittsburgh, Erie, Harrisburg, and Scranton as suffragan sees, and Dr. Wood became first Archbishop of Philadelphia. His services in ecclesiastical councils, his attendance at the Vatican, his visits to Rome, and his priestly and dignified intercourse with the world gave the archdiocese of Philadelphia a prestige which has been gracefully maintained to our day. He died on June 20, 1883, universally respected and venerated. His conversion seemed like a tribute from the business world to the world of religious truth and conscience, and has borne its noble fruits. Such were his labors that while in 1857, when he came to Philadelphia, he found in Eastern Pennsylvania and Delaware and West New Jersey one hundred and forty-seven churches, one hundred and fifty-five priests, four colleges, four literary institutions for girls, one theological seminary, one hospital, eight asylums, and thirty-three parochial schools, at the time of his death he left, in the greatly curtailed limits of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia, one hundred and twenty-seven churches, with eight others building; fifty-three chapels and thirty-one stations; in all, two hundred and eighteen altars where divine services were celebrated; two hundred and sixty priests, of whom sixty-four belonged to religious orders; ninety-nine ecclesiastical students; fifty-one Christian Brothers; one thousand and twenty religious sisters; three ecclesiastical in-

stitutions; three colleges; thirty-two thousand children attending parochial schools; six orphan asylums and other institutions; besides numerous confraternities, conferences, and devout and charitable societies.

Rev. Thomas S. Preston was descended from an old English family, settled in New England. His parents were Episcopalians, not Puritans, and he, after graduating at Trinity College, in 1843, became an Episcopal minister. Like Rev. Donald McLeod, he may be said to have been a disciple of Dr. Ives during his Protestant ministry, and was no doubt influenced by his example and by the writings of the Tractarians of Oxford. He entered the Catholic Church in 1846, studied for the priesthood at Troy, and was ordained a priest by Cardinal McCloskey, then Bishop of Albany, on November 16, 1850. After service at the cathedral and at Yonkers, he became secretary and chancellor under Archbishop McCloskey at New York. He was appointed pastor of St. Ann's in 1862; vicar-general in 1873 by Cardinal McCloskey; was made a domestic prelate to Pope Pius IX., with the title of Monsignor, on December 13, 1881; and Prothonotary Apostolic on August 21, 1888. His remarkable capacity for business and his attention thereto were shown in the success with which he discharged the duties of chancellor and vicar-general until his death, as well as administrator during the short absences of Archbishop Corrigan. He was a man of learning, ability, zeal, piety, and dignity, and was remarkable for his priestly carriage and deportment. He was the spiritual adviser of Mother Veronica Starr in founding the Sisters of the Divine Compassion. While ever preserving his courtly manners, he was humble, ascetic, and self-denying, and devoted much time, amid his labors, to writing spiritual books. He died on November 1, 1891, greatly and universally respected and beloved. In 1881 he received the degree of LL.D. from Seton Hall College, and that of D.D. from Georgetown College in 1889.

The Right Rev. Richard Gilmour was the only child of John and Marion Gilmour, who were strict Scotch Covenanters. He was born in Scotland on September 28, 1824. His parents settled in Pennsylvania, on coming to this country, near Latrobe, where their son, by his brightness and application, advanced beyond the curriculum of the village school. At the age of eighteen he was sent to Philadelphia to a higher academy, and, being a fine musician, he took delight, during his vacations and between the services, in playing on the organ of the Church of St. Francis, at Fairmount, for his amusement. Thus he made the acquaintance of Rev. Patrick Rafferty, who gave him access to the organ, and he commenced finally to attend divine services there and to hear Catholic sermons. After the study and deliberation of two years,

accompanied with prayer, he became a Catholic at the age of twenty and immediately offered himself for the priesthood. In September, 1846, he commenced his theological studies at Mt. St. Mary's College at Emmetsburg, Maryland, soon became prefect and professor of higher mathematics, and, on August 30, 1852, was ordained a priest at the Cincinnati Cathedral by Archbishop Purcell. Such was the ardor of his missionary labors that he was compelled to take rest from them by becoming a professor at Mt. St. Mary's of the West. He again went on the missions, until 1872, when he was appointed Bishop of Cleveland to succeed the saintly Bishop Rappe. He was a laborious Bishop and gave a fine organization to his diocese. He extended his vigilant labors to all parts of it, and was a fearless defender of justice and truth. He was a great patron of parochial schools, insisting on schools in all his parishes, prepared rules for their management and a series of readers which were adopted throughout the country. He did much to vindicate the memory and the administration of his good predecessor Bishop Rappe, and he erected a monument to his memory. He established the "Catholic Universe" for the vindication of Catholic truth. A sun-stroke prostrated his powerful frame, which was already weakened by labor and anxiety. He went to Florida in 1891 and was the guest of Bishop Moore of St. Augustine, where he improved a little, but soon grew worse, and died on April 13th, of that year.

Right Rev. Edgar Philip Wadhams was born in Lewis, Essex County, New York; his parents had him educated for the ministry of the Episcopalian Church. He studied at the Middlebury College, in Vermont, and graduated at the Episcopal Theological Seminary at New York, and received a Deacon's orders. Religion was his earnest study and his sincere search for truth led him into the Catholic Church, into which he was received by Rev. Peter Fredet, at St. Mary's Sulpician Seminary, Baltimore. He studied the sacred course of studies at St. Mary's Seminary, and, on January 15, 1850, he was ordained a Catholic priest in St. Mary's Pro-Cathedral at Albany by Bishop, afterward Cardinal McCloskey. He served zealously as an assistant priest at the Albany Cathedral, until 1865, then as pastor of the Cathedral and was appointed Vicar General of the Albany diocese. In 1872, the new diocese of Ogdensburg was erected, and Father Wadhams was appointed its first Bishop. He was a most zealous and self-sacrificing prelate, built many churches and schools, and, though he incurred heavy pecuniary responsibilities, time and his own great efforts enabled him to pay them. He introduced the Clerks of St. Viateur and placed them in charge of schools at Ogdensburg. He founded other schools at Croghan and Mohawk Hill and placed over

them the Franciscan Sisters; at Watertown he established a boy's college and confided it to the Fathers of the Sacred Heart, and he founded other schools and did much for the advancement of his clergy in sacred learning and piety. His zealous labors greatly increased churches, educational institutions and works of charity. He died November 11, 1891; his death was most edifying, and showed the true Christian and priestly character.

Born of Protestant parents at Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, on December 22, 1832, Dr. Thomas A. Becker, the present learned Bishop of Savannah, Georgia, received a fine education at Alleghany Institute, Western University and the University of Virginia. At Richmond he met the late Bishop McGill, whose powerful mind and close logical reasoning found a ready response and a thorough conviction in his disciple's well trained intellect. Divine grace did the rest. Dr. Becker not only embraced the grace of truth, but he dedicated his life to its propagation, entered the the Urban College of the Roman Propaganda, in 1852, where he took the degree of Doctor of Theology and was ordained at the Basilica of St. John Lateran, on June 18, 1859, by Cardinal Patrizi. As a priest he rendered valuable services on the mission in the Richmond Diocese, and at Baltimore, and as a professor in educational institutions, including Mt. St. Mary's College. While at the Baltimore Cathedral, by reason of his ecclesiastical learning he was selected by Archbishop Spaulding one of the commission to prepare the matters which were to be brought before the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore. He was afterwards serving at the Richmond Cathedral, when he was appointed first Bishop of Wilmington, Delaware. He organized his new Diocese, greatly increased its priests, churches, schools, and benevolent works, and made his zealous influences beneficially felt in all its parishes. He was a man of signal learning and scientific attainments. He contributed many valuable articles to Catholic literature, and especially the pages of this REVIEW. In the Third Plenary Council he was chosen to preach the sermon on the "The Church and Science." On March 26, 1866, he was appointed Bishop of Savannah to succeed Archbishop Gross, and in this field he has labored with zeal, courage and success. He has made many converts.

The Right Rev. Alfred A. Curtis, who succeeded Bishop Becker in the See of Wilmington, is a native of Maryland; born about 1833, he received a thorough education far beyond the usual curriculum of Protestant ministers, was also a fine Hebrew scholar, and was ordained in the Episcopal ministry, in 1859. His logical and devout mind worked its way through Ritualism to Catholic truth; he resigned the rectorship of Mt. Calvary Church towards

the close of 1870, went to England, where he had frequent conferences with Cardinal Newman on religion, and was received by him into the Church in April, 1871. Returning to Baltimore, he entered St. Mary's Seminary to study for the Catholic priesthood, and was ordained by another eminent convert, Archbishop Bayley, in December, 1874. His services in the pulpit, on the missions, and in society were valuable, for he is a fine theologian, scripturist, versed in Patristic learning, a zealous churchman, a devout Christian and accomplished gentleman. While serving as secretary and assistant at the Baltimore Cathedral under Cardinal Gibbons, he was appointed Bishop of Wilmington. He is destined to render great services to religion, to prepare the Protestant mind to accept the truths of Catholic teaching, and to be eminently useful in the Hierarchy and the Church.

I will now relate a conversion of extraordinary individuality, because of the peculiar elevation of character of the convert, the early period of life when his struggles for truth and goodness commenced, the peculiar course of study through which he passed, and the far-reaching consequences to which his conversion led. Isaac Thomas Hecker, born on December 18, 1819, commenced his remarkable career in poverty and manual labor, as a baker; he closed it gloriously as the venerated founder of an American Order or Congregation of Missionary Priests, the Paulists, so named from that illustrious convert and apostle of the Gentiles, St. Paul. Young Hecker, from his boyhood, seemed to aspire to as yet to him an unknown good; to seek an undiscovered type of benevolence and social improvement; to yearn for something better, more spiritual, and yet more humane. He possessed a great ideal; he struggled for the reality. Socialism was the only means he could then conceive of for this work; transcendentalism was his fountain of theories. While laboring manually and thereby supporting himself as a boy, he seized every spare moment for study, when, too, he saw no examples of study around him. When still young he joined his two brothers, John and George, both of whom were men of large benevolence, in the flour business—there was to Isaac a symbol of life in bread—but just as success was beginning to crown their honest efforts, Isaac took up the study of philosophy, with Kant as his text-book, mingling with it the study of metaphysics and theology. He abandoned all mercantile pursuits, and in 1843, when twenty-four years old, he entered the community of Brook Farm, which was a temporary sojourn and experiment of many eminent Americans in search of a higher good; and here his heart found contentment and peace temporarily in baking the bread for the community to eat. After nine months, failing to find his ideal, he left Brook

Farm in company with the celebrated transcendentalist, Henry D. Thoreau, who was much his elder. The two philosophers endeavored to discover by personal experience the least that human life could be sustained on. They reduced the sufficient consumption of food to the value of nine cents per day per man. He next taught his complete system of truth, spirituality, and social good in the Worcester "Consociates." He then yielded to the earnest entreaties of his good brothers in again joining them in business, but upon the express condition that they should all three possess all things in common, keep no separate purses, and should own no separate properties; and Isaac alone was to handle and manage the men employed by the firm. His purpose in this was soon manifest in his providing a library for the laborers, equipping a hall for their amusements, and he delighted to lecture for them. He could endure this life but a year, when, abandoning business, another form of socialism engaged his sympathies and studies—that of the celebrated Fourier; but his mind soon penetrated its impracticability when applied to real life and society. Many of us can recall the crusade made by the Presbyterian minister, William Craig Brownlee, about 1844, against Catholics and Quakers, whom he equally hated. So far from influencing young Hecker against Catholics, of whose tenets he then knew but little, he thought if Catholics were justly assailable, some other means than vituperation would rationally be resorted to; and he commenced to study revealed religion as witnessed and taught by the Catholic Church. He continued these studies while on a visit to his transcendentalist friend, Thoreau, in Massachusetts; and the next year, while there, he became a convert to the Catholic Church. He had now found what his soul and intellect had sought—a clear and logical perception of religious truth and a boundless field for humanity, philanthropy, charity, and good of every kind. But how was he to serve his fellow-men? "In the Catholic priesthood," was his own answer, and in the Missionary Congregation of the Redemptorists, laboring for souls. He joined the Redemptorists, spent his novitiate at Saint Trond, in Belgium, studied Catholic theology with St. Ligouri's works always before him, and in 1849 he was ordained a Redemptorist priest in London by Cardinal Wiseman. Returning to the United States, he devoted seven years to missionary work, holding missions and preaching in all parts of the country. High as this exalted labor was, Father Hecker had not yet attained his highest ideal, and this was found by him at Rome in his own plan—then and there sanctioned by Pope Pius IX., and afterwards executed—of the Congregation of Missionary Priests of St. Paul the Apostle. While the labors of the Redemptorists were chiefly among the

German Catholics, the field selected by the Paulists was among the English-speaking Catholics of America, and to reach the honest Protestant American mind. In his exalted purpose Father Hecker was joined by four other American converts, Redemptorists—Fathers Hewit, Deshon, Baker, and Walworth—and all five were dispensed by the Pope from their vows as Redemptorists. Father Hecker was the superior of the Paulists, by their choice, from their organization in 1858 to his death in 1888. The history of his life now becomes the history of the Paulist Community, and this is a great and fascinating work in itself; it has been gracefully and gratefully written by one of the companions of Father Hecker, Father Walter Elliot. Among the fruits of his sublime life and of the Paulists may be mentioned an easier access between the Protestant American mind and the Catholic Church, numerous conversions, the establishment of the Catholic Publication Society and the monthly *Catholic World*, the founding of the Convent and Congregation of St. Paul, several published volumes of Paulist sermons, and several works of great ability on religious and spiritual subjects. Father Hecker relied greatly, in his conceptions and plans, upon the printing press, and he told me that he aspired to the development of a religious order of priests, sisters, and brothers who, among themselves, would do the whole work of writing for the truth, setting the type, and publication, thus consecrating priests, nuns and brothers, the pen, the hand, and the press, to the service of God.

Miss Eliza Allen Starr was born in Deerfield, Massachusetts, August 29, 1824, and is a cousin of Fanny Allen, whose conversion is mentioned herein. Educated at Deerfield, she became a Catholic at Philadelphia in 1850. From the time of her conversion she has devoted herself to the study of Christian art, and by her lectures, writings, and classes has greatly diffused in many cities a love for and study of religious and devotional art. She removed to Chicago in 1856. She is noted for her strong Catholic faith and generosity, and has made many converts among educated people; possesses learning, eloquence, and heroic zeal. She received the Lætare Medal from the University of Notre Dame, in recognition of her services to religion and to art and of her beautiful writings. In behalf of the Cardinal, and many Archbishops, Bishops, priests, and eminent laymen, the present writer presented to her at Easter, 1893, a magnificent testimonial, beautifully embossed and illuminated, handsomely printed, and now hanging in St. Joseph's Cottage, her residence at Chicago. Type of Christian womanhood, she is a leading spirit among American converts.

While the conversion of Father Hecker pre-eminently illustrates

the aspirations of a noble soul, that of Dr. Orestes Augustus Brownson pre-eminently manifests the aspirations of a noble intellect; and yet Father Hecker had a noble intellect, and Dr. Brownson had a noble soul. Dr. Brownson started life as a Puritan in faith of the strictest school. Though fond of reading, the first regular academic education he received was acquired with his own frugal savings at Ballston, Saratoga County. Born in Vermont in 1803, he joined the Presbyterians in 1822, and in his search always for the highest and the best, became a minister of that sect till 1825, when, following what seemed logical courses of reasoning, he reached Universalism, and became a minister and preacher of it, and edited the *Gospel Advocate*. In 1828 he made the acquaintance of Robert Owen, the celebrated social philosopher and friend of labor, and then Dr. Brownson, seeking always a higher good, became an Owenite, or, as he styled it, a "World Reformer"; it was in some sense the religion of humanity. Dr. Brownson developed the intellectuality of this sect, following Cousin, St. Simon and other socialist writers. He aided in forming the Workingmen's Party in New York in 1838, but soon saw its impracticability. The celebrated Dr. Channing in 1832 won this earnest and deep searcher after the true and the good to Unitarianism, and herein, too, he became a minister and preacher, and this led logically, according to the doctor's premises, to his organizing in 1836 the Boston Society for Christian Union and Progress. In his work entitled, "The Convert," he does not hesitate to call some of his views "horrible doctrines." But they only seemed to him such in the retrospect from a more perfect state. His efforts to serve society and elevate the masses led to his becoming a political leader; of course he had to become a Democrat, but he was too upright and philosophical to obey any political machine. In 1836 he published his "New Views of Christian Society and the Church," which was strongly anti-Protestant. In 1838 he published and edited the *Boston Quarterly Review*, which was afterwards merged in the New York *Democratic Review*. In 1840 he published "Charles Elwood, or the Infidel Converted," a philosophical treatise embodying his own experiences, which showed how his robust mind had saved him from atheism. During all these years Dr. Brownson's intellectual activity and the productions of his pen were marvelous. It was evident that his great intellect was ever in search of some certain and infallible standard of truth; a Church was necessary as a witness of the truth to man. He saw that man could not create the Church, but, on the contrary, man must seek and recognize the Church as the channel of truth. This course of reasoning led him to embrace the Catholic faith in 1844. He then refused to allow a second edition of

"Charles Elwood"; his *Review* now was called *Brownson's Quarterly Review*. It was his own personal organ. He said the simple catechism was his text-book, and it is a remarkable fact that this great and ever-active intellect, after almost forty years of study, teaching and writing, dated his real intellectual and moral life from the day of his conversion to the Catholic faith. His writings were numerous and powerful. Admitted once into the realms of truth, his defence of it was masterly, convincing, overpowering, unanswerable. He had many controversies; he made many converts; his voluminous writings underwent a critical and authoritative examination at Rome, and were pronounced sound. His convictions and perceptions of truth were so luminous that he could brook no opposition in its advocacy, and his impetuous nature led him to use too vigorous or even unsparing language. His faith was accompanied by tender piety. He died in 1876 at Detroit, a devout Catholic and child of the Church, to which he bequeathed the rich inheritance of his invaluable writings.

One year after the conversion of Dr. Brownson, in 1844, he was followed into the Church by James A. McMaster, in 1845. With great precocity of intellect and a fine classical education, with an ardent nature and a fearless courage, Mr. McMaster was a man evidently destined for an active, aggressive and useful career in the economies of Providence. His Puritanic training gave a stern and militant cast to his Catholic life. He was a fine scholar, and possessed an analytical and logical mind. His first change was from Calvinism to Episcopalianism, but he was too consistent a reasoner and searcher after truth to stop there; he soon found himself in the Catholic Church. The chief lesson of his life is that of submission to the will of God in determining and embracing the sphere of greatest usefulness. To ascertain this he entered the novitiate of the Redemptorists in Belgium for meditation and study; and though he aspired to the priesthood, he surrendered his will to the advice of his confessor, who told him his vocation was that of journalism. Had he gone into secular journalism, his reputation and fortune would have been great; but it was true heroism to have selected, as he did, the field of Catholic journalism, which was needy, unrequiting and stormy. But he entered it in order to defend the truth which he had espoused. As editor of the *Freeman's Journal*, from 1848 till his death in 1886, he became a champion of Catholic truth against her enemies, and the defender of Catholic discipline, morality and tradition against all opponents within and without. By his energy, fire, learning and piety, he made the *Journal* the leading Catholic paper of America. Its editorials were as much feared by unworthy or improvident Catholics as by the open enemies of the Church. Such was the

Catholic tone of his household that he freely sacrificed every social consolation in freely giving all of his three daughters to the religious and conventual vocations. He pointed out the way for the Catholic laity to serve religion in the journalistic and literary career, and he gave them the example.

The conversion of Dr. Levi Silliman Ives is particularly interesting, as he was the only Protestant Bishop since the Reformation that has become reconciled to the Catholic Church. Born on September 16, 1797, at Meriden, Connecticut, and reared in the Presbyterian faith, at the age of twenty he "experienced religion," and became a professing member of that communion. He received a good education, served a year as lieutenant in the War of 1812. In 1819, when twenty-two, being a man of religious aspirations, he abandoned the untenable position of Presbyterianism, and embraced Episcopalianism, which seemed to him nearer the truth. He studied for the ministry at Philadelphia, was ordained a deacon by Bishop White, and in the same year was married to Rebecca, the daughter of Bishop Hobart, of New York. Having filled various positions as assistant minister or as minister, in 1831 he was consecrated the Episcopal Bishop of North Carolina. He was a man of strong and tender feelings; he and his flock were devotedly attached to each other. The light of Christian antiquity began to dawn upon his mind, and like the Puseyites and Tractarians of England, and the Ritualists of our country, he thought the ancient faith and ritual could be restored in the Episcopal Church. The trials through which Dr. Ives passed would be incredible had he not so graphically related them himself. The struggle between divine light and grace on the one hand, and the convictions, associations and tender ties of an earnest and sincere life on the other, gave an appearance of vacillation to his later career; but when all these were overcome, he went straight to Rome. On Christmas day, 1852, he made his profession of Catholic faith to Pope Pius IX., and laid his episcopal ring at the Sovereign Pontiff's feet. During the heartrending trials through which Dr. Ives had passed, his devoted wife tenderly clung to him and consoled him, and at Rome she, too, became a Catholic. Rev. Donald McLeod, the friend and disciple of Dr. Ives (two pure souls that commenced together in the graces of the natural order, and confessing to each other, like David and Jonathan, in their spiritual intercourse), soon followed his example. In a temporal, social and civil aspect it is heroic to contemplate the sacrifices made by this exalted man. But he was marked out by Providence for a high vocation. Having returned to New York, and while lecturing in Catholic academies and schools in his characteristically clear and cultivated style, and with his acknowledged

learning and eloquence, God manifested to him his great missionary work, and he bravely embraced it. Under this inspiration he became the founder and first president of the New York Catholic Protectory, an institution which has since its foundation sheltered and educated nearly thirty thousand Catholic children rescued from the streets of New York. In his last years he suffered much and patiently, awaiting his great reward. These years were spent in the family and household of the present writer, to whom he imparted his hopes and prayers, and the traditions of the Protectory, and to whom he truly predicted his succession in time to his own office and labors of the Protectory. As atoms we come and go in this fleeting world; but there is an eternal, spiritual world where the souls are beautiful forever. It is only for recording angels to know and write the number of young souls that may be beautified in heaven for eternity through the institution which Dr. Ives founded on earth.

It would be improper to conclude this paper without a particular reference also to the remarkable conversion of Rev. James Kent Stone; for it was through him that a generous and prompt response was made, as we hope in behalf of millions yet to follow from the ranks of Protestants, to the call for Christian unity which Pope Pius IX. addressed to all Protestants as Christians "acknowledging the same Jesus Christ as the Redeemer, and glorying in the name of Christian." Born in Boston in 1840; graduated at Harvard in 1861; a student at Göttingen University, and a soldier in the Union army in our Civil War, from which he returned with honorable wounds; he entered, in 1863, upon that educational career for which his brilliant training and rare gifts of nature and of grace so well qualified him. Professor in several chairs and president in the Protestant College of Kenyon, Ohio, from 1863 to 1868, and then president of Hobart College, New Jersey, in 1868. It was in 1869 that Pope Pius IX. convened the Œcumenical Council of the Vatican, and addressed the invitation, *Ad Omnes Protestantés Aliosque A catholicos*. There was not a member of the Protestant ministry in this country whose certain and assured future was more brilliant. Dr. Stone states that he had through life prayed for light to see the truth, and conscientiously believed that he had found it in the Episcopal Church. He perused the invitation in the Letter Apostolic of Pius IX., as most Protestants did, with an almost contemptuous indifference, but he read it. It was certainly remarkable; while still unconscious of any change in his religious or theological beliefs or opinions, the light flashed upon him, and revealed only his former darkness, where he thought he saw light; but as he says, "My feet soon rested forever on the eternal rock." He heeded the invitation; he was re-

ceived into the one fold. But he sought more than this; he must seek to carry the light to others, and for this end he became a priest; joined the Congregation of the Missionary Priests of St. Paul the Apostle, and his announcement of the Word of God was most effectual. Yearning for a yet more ascetic life, he next became a Passionist, or member of the Congregation of the Discalced Clerks of the Most Holy Cross and Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ;” received the monastic name of Father Fidelis. There is a similarity between the Passionists and Paulists: while the founder of the former, St. Paul of the Cross, aspired to the conversion of England, the latter, following also the example of St. Paul, in seeking the conversion of the Gentiles, aspired to the conversion of America. The Passionists in America have sought their field here instead of England, both Congregations laboring in similar but different fields. Since he became a Passionist, Father Fidelis has extended the apostolate both to North and South America with abundant fruits.

Our converts have not only zealously preached the Gospel amongst us by eloquent word and edifying example, but they have also left to the American Church for all time an enduring legacy of sacred literature. While our serial publications contain articles almost every month entitled “Why I became a Catholic,” many of our converts have published religious works of invaluable worth. Many have contributed to our general literature.

Father Thayer has left for the study of coming generations such works as “Controversy between Rev. John Thayer, Catholic Missionary of Boston and Rev. George Leslie, pastor of a church in Washington, N. H. (Boston, 1703); “An account of the conversion of Rev. Mr. John Thayer, lately a Protestant minister at Boston, in North America, who embraced the Roman Catholic religion at Rome, on the 25th of May, 1783, written by himself,” (Baltimore 1788). This work went through many editions and was translated and published in French, Spanish and Italian.

Stephen Cleveland Blyth, who studied many religions, even mastering Mohammedanism, published at New York, in 1815, his masterly “Apology for the conversion of Stephen Cleveland Blyth.” Rev. Daniel Barber wrote “Catholic Worship and Piety, Explained and Recommended in Sundry Letters to a Very Dear Friend and Others” (Washington, 1821) and “History of My own Times” (Washington, 1827). Rev. Demetrius Augustine Gallitzin published “Defence of Catholic Principles in a Letter to a Protestant Clergyman (1816); “Letter to a Protestant Friend on the Holy Scriptures (Ebensburg, 1820); “Appeal to the Protestant Public”; “Six Letters of Advice” (1834). Archbishop Bayley wrote “Sketch of the History of the Catholic

Church on the Island of New York" (New York, 1853, revised in 1869); "Memoirs of Simon Gabriel Bruté, first Bishop of Vincennes" (1860); and "Pastorals for the People." Dr. Brownson's works are numerous; those prior to his conversion were "New Views of Christian Society and the Church" (Boston, 1836); "Charles Elwood, or the Infidel Converted," 1840, and he edited or wrote for the "Gospel Advocate," the "Philanthropist," the "Christian Examiner," the "Boston Quarterly Review," and "Democratic Review." After his conversion he published "Essays and Reviews" (New York, 1852); "The Spirit Rapper, an Autobiography" (Boston, 1854); "The Convert, or Leaves from My Experience" (New York, 1858); "The American Republic, its Christian Tendencies and Destiny" (1865); "Conversation on Liberalism and the Church" (1870); but the great bulk of his learned and valuable writings are to be found in "Brownson's Quarterly Review." Late in life he contributed articles to the *Catholic World*, and *Tablet*. Many of his works have been translated into European languages. His works have been collected and published by his son, Henry F. Brownson, at Detroit, in nineteen volumes.

Father Hecker's works, in addition to numerous valuable and characteristic papers chiefly published in the *Catholic World*, are "Questions of the Soul" (New York, 1855); "Aspirations of Nature" (1857); "Catholicity in the United States" (1870); "Catholics and Protestants agreeing on the School Question" (1881). Dr. Ives's works, while a Protestant were, a "Catechism," a "Manual of Devotion," "Humility a Ministerial Qualification" (1840); "Sermons on the Obedience of Faith" (1849); and while a Catholic "The Trials of a Mind in its Progress to Catholicism; a Letter to His Old Friends" (Boston, 1853). The Rev. Mr. J. J. Maximillian Oertel published "The Reasons of J. J. M. Oertel, late a Lutheran Minister, for becoming a Catholic" (New York, 1840). The only work of Hon. Peter H. Burnett, "The Path which led a Protestant Lawyer to the Catholic Church" (New York, 1860), is remarkably valuable and interesting, because of its peculiar feature of handling the question upon legal methods and evidence. The writings of Rt. Rev. Thomas S. Preston were "Ark of the Covenant, or Life of the Blessed Virgin Mary" (New York, 1860); "Life of St. Mary Magdalen" (1860); "Sermons for the principal Seasons of the Sacred Year" (1864); "Life of St. Vincent de Paul and its Lessons" (1866); "Lectures on Christian Unity, Advent" (1866); "The Purgatorian Manual, or Selections of Prayers and Devotions" (1867); "Lectures on Reason and Revelation" (1868); "The Vicar of Christ" (1871); "The Divine Sanctuary; series of "Meditations upon the Most

Sacred Heart of Jesus" (1878); "Divine Paraclete" (1880); "Protestantism and the Bible" (1880); "God and Reason" (1884); "Watch on Calvary" (1885).

Rev. Alfred Young, besides many Catholic magazine articles, has published "The Complete Sodality Hymn Book" (New York, 1863); "Catholic Hymns and Canticles" (1888); "The Office of Vespers" (1869); "The Catholic Hymnal" (1884); and "Carols for a Merry Christmas and Joyous Easter" (1885-6). Rev. James Kent Stone (Father Fidelis) wrote "The Invitation Heeded" (New York, 1872).

Mrs. Anna Hanson Dorsey wrote "May Brooks," which, when republished in Scotland, was the first Catholic Book published in that country since the Reformation; "The Student of Blenheim Forest" (Baltimore, 1847); "Flowers of Love and Memory" (Poems, 1849); "Oriental Pearl" (1857); "Woodreve Manor" (Phila., 1856); "Coaina, the Rose of the Algonquins" (1868); "Nora Brady's Vow" (Boston, 1869); "Mona, the Vestal" (1869); "The Flemings, or Truth Triumphant" (New York, 1869); "The Old Gray Rosary" (1870); "Guy the Leper," an epic poem (Baltimore, 1850); "Tangled Paths" (1879); "The Old Home at Glenara" (Balto., 1886); "Warp and Woof" (1887); "Palms" (1887).

Rev. Augustine F. Hewit, C. S. P., editor of the *Catholic World*, for which he wrote much, has published: "Reasons for Submitting to the Catholic Church" (Charleston, 1846); "Life of Princess Borghese" (New York, 1856); "Life of Durnenlin-Borie," an Annamite Missionary (1857); "The Little Angel of the Copts"; "Life of Rev. Francis A. Baker" (1865); "Problems of the Age, with Studies in St. Augustine and on Kindred Subjects" (1868); "Light in Darkness, a Treatise on the Obscure Night of the Soul" (1870); "The King's Highway, or the Catholic Church the Way of Salvation, as Revealed in Holy Scriptures" (1874).

Mrs. Madeleine Vinton Dahlgren, widow of Admiral Dahlgren, wrote: "Idealities" (Philadelphia, 1859); "Thoughts on Female Suffrage" (Washington, 1871); "South Sea Sketches" (Boston, 1881); "Etiquette of Social Life in Washington" (Philadelphia, 1881); "South Mountain Magic" (1882); "A Washington Winter" and "Memoirs of John A. Dahlgren" (1882); "Lights and Shadows of Life" (Boston, 1886); and translated several important works, including Donoso Cortes' "Catholicism, Liberalism and Socialism," for which she received the thanks of Pope Pius IX.

Rev. Donald McLeod was editor of the *St. Louis Leader*, and published: "Pynnshurst; His Wanderings and Ways of Think-

ing" (New York, 1852); "Life of Sir Walter Scott" (1852); "Life of Mary, Queen of Scots" (1857); "The Elder's House, Three Converts"; "Chateau Lescure, or the Late Marquis"; "Life of Fernando Wood, Mayor of New York" (New York, 1856); "The Saga of Viking Torquil," and "The Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary." Eliza Allen Starr, besides many valuable articles on religion and art, wrote: "Patron Saints" (New York, 1871); "Pilgrims and Shrines" "Songs of a Lifetime" (Chicago, 1887). Bishop Gilmour compiled "School Recreations," a collection of hymns, etc. Frances C. Fisher, whose *nom de plume* is Christian Reid, wrote "Valerie Aylmer" (N. Y. 1870); "Morton House" (1871); "Mabel Lee" (1871); "Ebb Tide" (1872); "Nina's Atonement" (1873); "A Daughter of Bohemia" (1873); "Carmen's Inheritance" (Phil. 1873); "A Gentle Belle" (N. Y. 1875); "Hearts and Hands" (1875); "A Question of Honor" (1875); "Land of the Sky" (1875); "Bonny Kate" (1878); "A Summer Idyl" (1878); "Hearts of Steel" (1882); "After Many Days" (1877); "Armene" (1884); "Roslyn's Fortune" (1885); and "Miss Churchill" (1887).

Rev. George Mary Searle wrote on astronomical subjects for the *Catholic World* and *Astronomical Journal*, and was the author of "Elements of Geometry" (N. Y. 1877). Mary Agnes Tinker, a native of New England, was a frequent contributor to the *Catholic World*, and was the author of "The House of York," "Grapes and Thorns," and other works. Dr. Brownson said: "She has won a high place, if not, indeed, the very highest, place among our American female Catholic writers of fiction." "She has the eye of a poet for natural scenery, and her pictures of nature are fresh, original, and truthful." Charles Warren Stoddard was the correspondent of the *San Francisco Chronicle*, and published his "Poems" (San Francisco, 1867); "South Sea Idyls" (Boston, 1873); "Mashallah, or Flight into Egypt" (N. Y. 1881); and "The Lepers of Molokai" (Notre Dame, 1885).

Laura Keene published a weekly art journal in New York and constructed sacred plays. Dr. Jedediah Vincent Huntington edited at different times the *Metropolitan Magazine*, in Baltimore, and the *St. Louis Leader*, and published his "Poems" (N. Y. 1843); "Lady Alice, or the New Una" (N. Y. and London, 1849); "Alban, or the History of a Young Puritan" (1850-53); "The Pretty Plate" (1852); "The Forest," a sequel (1853); "America Discovered" (1853); "Blonde and Brunette" (1858); "Rosemary" (1860); he also translated Franchère's "Narrative of a Voyage to the Northwest Coast of America in 1811-14" (1854) and Segur's "Short and Familiar Answers to Objections against Religion" (1854). Rev. Clarence A. Walworth's works

are "The Gentle Skeptic" (N. Y. 1860); "The Doctrine of Hell Ventilated in a Discussion between Rev. C. A. Walworth and William H. Burr, Esq." (1874); "Andiatarocete, or the Eve of Lady Day on Lake George, and other Poems, Hymns, and Meditations in Verse" (1886). Right Rev. Sylvester H. Rosecrans wrote the "Divinity of Christ." Rev. George F. Haskins was the author of "Travels in England, France, Italy, and Ireland."

Octavia Walton Le Vert, of Alabama, published her "Souvenirs of Travel" (Mobile, 1858), and wrote "Souvenirs of Distinguished People" and "Souvenirs of the War," which were never published. Miss Hemenway, annalist, published the "Historical Annals of Vermont." Elizabeth Fries Ellet published her translation of Silvio Pellico's "Euphemia of Messina" (1834); "Theresa Contarini," a tragedy (1835); "Poems, Original and Selected" (1835); "Scenes in the Life of Joanna of Sicily" (1840); "Characters of Schiller" (1842); "Evenings at Woodlawn" (1850); "Family Pictures from the Bible" (1849); "Domestic History of the American Revolution" (1850); "Watching Spirits" (1851); "Women of the American Revolution" (1851); "Pioneer Women of the West" (1852); "Novelettes of the Musicians" (1852); "Summer Rambles in the West" (1852); "The Practical Housekeeper, a Cyclopedia of Domestic Economy" (1857); "Women Artists in all Ages and Countries" (1861); "Queens of American Society" (1867); "Court Circles of the Republic" (together with Mrs. R. E. Mack) (Hartford, 1869). George Parsons Lathrop, besides having been connected editorially with the *Atlantic Monthly* and the *Boston Courier*, wrote "Rose and Roof-tree," poems (Boston, 1875); "Study of Hawthorne" (1876); "Afterglow" (1876); in 1877, edited and contributed to "A Masque of Poets," and in 1883 edited an edition of Nathaniel Hawthorne's Works, with a Biography and Introduction; his other works are "An Echo of Passion" (Boston, 1883); "In the Distance" (1882); "Spanish Vistas" (N. Y. 1883); "History of the Union League of Philadelphia" (Phil. 1883); "Newport" (N. Y. 1884); "True" (1884); and he wrote a dramatic adaptation of Alfred Tennyson's "Elaine" (1887). He has lately collected and published his "Poems" in one volume. Rose Hawthorne Lathrop, wife of George Parsons Lathrop, has contributed poems and prose articles to the serial literature of the country, which we would like to see collected and published in a separate volume. Both, since their conversion, have contributed articles to our Catholic literature and magazines, and have taken an active part in Catholic movements.

In mentioning that our converts have almost wholly come to

us from other Christian societies, and not from heathen or unbelieving schools, I had no reference to conversions among our North American Indians, of whom there are now about two hundred and fifty thousand surviving, and of these about one-half are Catholics. My theme has relation chiefly to our own Caucasian race and civilization—to the growth of the Apostolic Church in a Christian republic which has not directly recognized her divine mission, and in which Church and State are separate.

But there is one convert of special historical interest, of fame as bright as the summer sun, of faith as strong and pure as gold, of angelic soul, and of virtue supernatural, whom I must briefly mention—the celebrated Indian maiden, the flower of the Five Nations, the lily of the valley of the Mohawk, Catharine Toga-kouita. Born in paganism, in 1656, at Gandahouagué, of an Iroquois father and a Huron mother, she inherited the natural virtues of two heroic tribes; but she lost both parents when a child. While yet without the fold she dedicated her life to perpetual virginity, and, as a child, of her own motion, she sought the faith and received it from the Jesuit Fathers among the Iroquois; thenceforth she advanced in sanctity, feasting spiritually upon the sacraments and breathing constantly the air of the temple and the sanctuary. From association with savage heathens she sought Christian and more congenial homes and shrines. She won the universal title of “*la bonne Catharine*,” even among the heathens. She finally fled from Ossernéan—where the martyred Father Joques had suffered before her, and she then suffered—to Sault St. Marie, to breathe the air of Catholic faith and piety; and well did the black gown of the Mohawk write to him of the Sault, “You will soon know the treasure we are giving you. Keep it well, therefore.” Even in her short life, Jesuit and Indian alike venerated her as a saint. In 1678, when she died at the age of twenty-two, her countenance assumed in death an angelic beauty, the rose and the lily uniting to make her beautiful; and the dusky sons of the forest, her own people, came from far and near, uniting with venerable priests and nuns in gazing untiringly at her angelic form. In Canada and America her name is venerated as a saint. At the shrine of Our Lady of the Martyrs, in our own valley of the Mohawk, her name is invoked with those of our martyrs, Father Joques and René Goupil. At Rome, on the conciliar petition of our hierarchy, followed by that of our Catholic people, the process is moving to her solemn beatification.

RICHARD H. CLARKE.

HAWAII AND ITS MISSIONARIES.

THE recent revolution in the Hawaiian Islands has brought its people and their civilization prominently before the notice of this country. The political features of that revolution or of the annexation of the islands to the United States we do not propose to discuss here. The history of the little Polynesian kingdom, which for half a century has been recognized by the world as an independent State, is in itself a most interesting study. To trace the progress of the different branches of the human race from barbarism to civilization is, indeed, the most useful task of history, as it is also one of the hardest. That such a progress has been made by a large number of nations during the past, while others have remained stationary in their condition, is a fact which cannot be questioned. Confining ourselves to written history, we know from Tacitus and Cæsar that the Germans and Britons of the first century of our era were in almost the same social conditions as the Iroquois and Hurons of our own land, as described by the historian of New France, Charlevoix, two centuries ago. The whole of Europe east and north of the Rhine and Danube was in a similar state of barbarous independence, while the Roman empire possessed a social condition differing but little from what is now recognized as civilization.

The various steps by which the skin-clad tribes of Northern warriors developed into the nations of modern Europe and their great colonies on this Continent, occupy the history of centuries, and those often centuries of turmoil and war in which little record was kept of social changes or the growth of institutions. The German barbarians of Tacitus have grown into the German empire, and the pirates of the North into the Scandinavian kingdoms and the British empire, but historians still dispute as to the influences which wrought these mighty social changes. On the other hand, the native population of our own country, though possessing equal physical vigor and rude courage with the old Vikings, has almost melted out of existence in two centuries at the contact of European civilization. Whence this difference in the fate of different races under apparently similar circumstances? Civilization, as we know it to-day, and as it has existed practically for at least twenty-five centuries, is a boon of the highest value to some races, whilst to others it seems a deadly poison. The recent history of the Polynesian race gives singular facilities for the study

of this remarkable fact, and it is mainly for this object that we purpose to sketch the history of Hawaii.

Though it is more than three hundred and fifty years since the ships of Spain first crossed the Pacific Ocean, it is only during the present century that its islands and their inhabitants have been brought into any real contact with Europeans. The small extent of most of the former and the absence of metals, offered little inducement either for colonization or conquest, especially while the American Continent was practically unoccupied. During the last century the exploring expeditions of Cook and La Perouse visited the principal groups of islands. Everywhere the natives were found unacquainted with Europeans or any foreign civilization. Even the use of iron was unknown, and except hogs and dogs in some islands, there were no domestic animals or even quadrupeds of any kind. The population of all the islands, from New Zealand to Hawaii, was of the same race, and similar in manners and religious beliefs. This race is sometimes known as the Maori, at others as the Polynesian, and forms as marked a division of mankind as the red men of our own Continent. In some of the southern groups, as Fiji, another stock more allied to the negro race is established, but there has been apparently little mixture between them and the Maori tribes. The latter are believed to have come originally by sea from the islands near Sumatra, whence they spread to Madagascar west and to Easter Islands eastward. The Malays of Java, Borneo and the Moluccas may have been originally the same race as the Polynesians, or they may have been colonists from Asia, whose arrival drove the Maoris to seek new homes. In any case, they have been for centuries a distinct race, and further advanced in material civilization. The natives of the Philippines are probably related to both races, but they have been Christians for over two centuries, and do not enter specially into the subject of this sketch.

When visited by Cook and La Perouse, a little over a century ago, the condition of the Hawaiian islanders was much the same as that of all the rest of their race. Physically they were among the finest specimens of the human family, and in intelligence and courage they were above the average of uncivilized peoples. They possessed a definite system of hereditary government, an aristocracy of chiefs, an organized priesthood, with stone temples and a certain code of laws and ideas of right and wrong. In spite of the want of iron, they were able to build canoes of sufficient size for long voyages. Though unacquainted with writing, they preserved their history in poetry like the Druids in ancient Ireland. Their government was much more monarchical than that of the American Indians, and the higher chiefs were regarded as of super-

human origin. Their wars were frequent and merciless, and domestic morality was scarcely known. Their religious practices were somewhat elaborate, long prayers and sacrifices being in use, but the moral observances imposed by their belief were almost wholly limited to observing an arbitrary code of prohibitions known as tabus.

The tabu was in some respects a systematic application of superstitious ideas about lucky and unlucky things, resembling those prevalent among many persons in civilized lands. As we find people who deem it unlucky to begin work on a Friday or sit down at table with twelve companions, so the heathen Hawaiians dreaded undefinable mischief from violating any of the numerous tabu prohibitions laid down by their priests. Thus a man might not eat at the same table with a woman, no matter what her rank, and women were forbidden to eat pork and other articles of diet which were lawful food for men. The code of tabu was not only enforced by popular prejudice, but also by the legal powers of the chiefs. A woman who presumed to taste pork or bananas was doomed to immediate death, if the fact were discovered. The tabus constituted an onerous load on the bulk of the population, but scarcely any dared to violate them. On some occasions human sacrifices were offered to the gods, either to gain victory in battle, or to obtain the recovery of some chief in case of illness. A belief in sorcery was general, and the practices resulting from it were like the voodooism of the West Indian negroes. Cannibalism was common among all the Polynesians, though in other respects they were far from a natural disposition to cruelty such as was shown by many of our own Indian tribes.

Socially, the inhabitants of the Polynesian Islands were universally hospitable, and addicted to feasts and light-hearted enjoyment. They were naturally kindly to strangers, and subsequent to Cook's voyages, several Europeans and Americans settled alone among the natives without fear. The attacks on vessels or boats which are so often mentioned by the earlier explorers can be traced almost always to previous aggressions on the part of the whites. Captain Cook lost his life in attempting to carry off the king of Hawaii, by whom he had been most hospitably treated. The explorer had received gifts of provisions and hogs to the value of some thousand dollars from the king. Yet when a boat was stolen by a few natives for the sake of its iron, Cook undertook to seize his entertainer as a hostage for the punishment of the offenders, and was killed in the attempt after the English sailors had fired on the crowd.

The native population were agricultural, depending on yams, taro and the bread fruit for their support, in addition to fisheries.

The islands, in spite of the wars among the tribes, were densely peopled everywhere. Cook estimated the population of the Hawaiian group at from three to four hundred thousand, and as at a later date one of the native chiefs was able to collect an army of sixteen thousand fighting men, the estimate seems not exaggerated. As the area of Hawaii is about four thousand square miles, and that of the whole group less than seven thousand, its population a hundred years ago was denser than that of any part of the United States at that time. Such were the Hawaiians in their native barbarism, and revolting as are some of its features, it cannot fairly be said to have been much lower than that of the ancestors of many European nations who now stand high in the scale of civilization.

The first white visitors to Hawaii were unfortunately of a different type from the men who civilized and Christianized the Picts and Wends, the Vikings and the Saxons in other days. Shortly after the visits of Cook and La Perouse, English and American trading ships began to find their way to Hawaii and the islands of the Pacific. There were many minor sources of wealth, such as sandalwood, pearls and whaling, in the Pacific islands and old and New England alike furnished keen traders to work them. During the first twenty years of this century the commerce of the world was almost confined to English and American vessels, owing to the destruction of the French marine in the wars of the Revolution. The seafarers who resorted to Hawaii nearly all spoke English in the early days. The influence of those visitors was anything but favorable to the moral improvement of the natives. The very lax moral code of the heathens was lowered by their civilized visitors. Drunkenness had been unknown, but the distillation of spirits was the first art of civilization introduced by foreign ships and in a few years it became fearfully common among the natives as well as the visitors. New diseases followed and decimated the population more effectually than their old wars. The foreign ships, too, made slight account of the lives of the natives, and on one occasion a trader to avenge some petty theft slaughtered nearly a hundred in cold blood, by repeated broadsides. Such were the first fruits of civilization in Hawaii.

In the meantime a chief of Hawaii, Kamehameha, of considerable abilities, had been extending his authority over the whole Hawaiian Group, which had hitherto been divided among several independent chiefs. In this respect Hawaii offers a striking resemblance to Madagascar, another country inhabited by the same race. As Radama established the Hova Empire in the African islands by the help of foreign weapons, so Kamehameha procured arms from his visitors and founded a petty empire in

Hawaii. In each country the victorious despot showed something of the spirit which actuated Peter the Great, of Russia, in introducing the material civilization of other lands among his barbarian subjects. Kamehameha made no change in the native religion, but on his death in 1819, his queen, Kahumanu, who succeeded to his authority, jointly with his son, formally abolished the established rites of tabu. It was forbidden for any woman to eat in the company of men, but the queen publicly set the law at defiance. A chieftain, who rose in arms in defence of the native religion, was defeated and killed and the whole system of tabu was abandoned by the population. It was policy, not any religious conviction, which determined this revolution, for Christianity was scarcely known in Hawaii. At the time two natives had been baptized by the Catholic chaplain of the French exploring ship *Uranic*, but no serious attempt was made or indeed would have been possible, during the limited stay of that expedition, to announce Catholicity to the bulk of the natives.

The Church from the earliest days has regarded the conversion of the heathen world, by missionary effort, as a most important part of its work. The exploration of Polynesia, unfortunately for its people, was begun at a most disastrous period for Catholic missions. The suppression of the Jesuits in 1773 was closely followed by the wars of the French Revolution, the imprisonment of two Popes and a general decay of the Catholic missions in uncivilized lands. It was only in 1822 that the Association for the Propagation of the Faith was established in Lyons and that a successful effort was thus made for the restoration and extension of the nearly ruined Catholic missions throughout the world.

Among the communities which adopted the various forms of Protestantism in the sixteenth century, missions for the conversion of the heathen were occasionally attempted but invariably without success. The conquests of England in Asia and America had no practical result in spreading Christianity among the conquered races. The latter were either exterminated like the American Indians or left to their old superstitions like the Hindoos. Still Protestant missionary societies in England and America continued to collect large sums and to apply part of them to sending out missionaries to various foreign lands where safety was guaranteed by England's naval power. As most of these missionaries were married and received fairly good salaries from their societies the work proved attractive to many, especially as the standard of qualification was not high. A Protestant missionary in fact has less work and better pay than the majority of those whom a spirit of adventure drives to seek a living in semi-civilized lands. The Pacific islands offered a good field for missionaries

of this class. There was little danger from the natives, who were impressed with seasonable fear of the well-armed European ships, the climate was healthy, the surroundings romantic and the contributions liberal. An English mission was sent to the Society Islands in 1819, others later to New Zealand, and in 1820 the American Missionary Board dispatched a colony of two ministers and five married laymen, accompanied by some Hawaiian sailors, who had been on board American vessels, to found a mission in Honolulu. Political events gave the new arrivals unexpected opportunities. The new queen and king had formally abolished the native religion just before the arrival of the missionaries, and the queen at least was anxious to introduce European customs among her people. John Young, an old sailor, who had been for years a favorite with Kamehameha and had helped him materially in his earlier wars by mounting guns and similar warlike services, gave a cordial welcome to the missionary party and recommended them warmly to the queen Kahumanu. The queen desired to make her people equal to white men and Messrs. Bingham and Thurston, the ministers, undertook the task cheerfully. A quarter of a century before, Vancouver, the commander of a British war vessel, had given Kamehameha some advice of a mixed religious and political character which was still remembered as a kind of oracle. He had informed the chief that his tabu superstitions were bad, and that he should put his islands under the protection and allegiance of the British crown. It is not probable that either suggestion was clearly comprehended; but the Hawaiian chief allowed the British flag to be hoisted as a sign of protection over his dominions, without any idea of thereby giving up his right to conquer his neighbors or rule at his own discretion. The tabu system he left untouched, either from superstitious fears, or because he knew of nothing to substitute for it and did not care to organize his new empire without its help. Kahumanu had now abolished the tabus and she took Bingham's advice to establish a nominal Christianity in its place, in much the same spirit as her late husband had accepted the nominal protectorate of George III. Mr. Bingham, as the teacher of the new religion, became her chief adviser.

The principal chiefs who formed the queen's Council and the supreme governing body of the islands, agreed with the sovereigns in making Bingham's religion a state institution to replace the discarded tabu system. The missionaries were well provided with funds by the zeal of New England Protestantism, and they proceeded to make the most of their new opportunities. Besides opening schools to teach English, they mastered the native language, reduced it to writing and published several more or

less accurate versions of the Scriptures and other books. The Hawaiians, like all Polynesians, are quick to learn and in a short time a number had learned to read and write in the native schools. Many were made religious teachers at short order by the American ministers and sent to teach the new religion in different parts of the islands. Supported by the authority of the queen's government, the Kumus, as the native catechists were called, succeeded to the powers formerly exercised by the Kuhinas or native priests of idols. Attendance at their instructions was made compulsory where practical, and such customs as the Calvinists considered unchristian were prohibited by law. The Christianity taught was of an extremely vague description. At one time baptism was requested as a mark of Christianity, at others it was declared unnecessary at the will of the ministers. In the laws published for the regulation of public morals there was a good deal of spirit of New England Calvinism of the last century. The native games and dances, were to a great extent prohibited and the Kumus and ministers undertook to regulate the daily life of their disciples with nearly the minuteness of the old heathen tabus.

In Honolulu these new laws led to several conflicts with the foreign sailors during the years between 1820 and 1830. The crews of the whalers and sandalwood traders which resorted to the islands were for the most part a lawless set, who looked on themselves as freed from all moral restraints at such a distance from home. The captains treated the authority of the native chiefs with contempt. A United States war vessel, the *Dolphin*, which touched at Honolulu in 1825, threatened to lay the fort in ashes, if the excesses of the crew on shore were interfered with by the native police. Some of the whalers threatened Mr. Richards, who was next to Bingham in influence among the missionaries, with personal violence on more than one occasion; others brought forward real or pretended claims against the native chiefs, and in 1826 the American sloop of war *Peacock*, commanded by Captain Jones, was sent out by this Government to investigate those claims. Captain Jones held an investigation in Honolulu and gave Mr. Richards a high character, but ordered the native chiefs to pay half a million dollars to the American claimants. This sum exceeded the whole yearly exports of the islands and was denounced as ten times greater than the alleged debts by the natives, but in Hawaii, as elsewhere, might make right. A heavy tax of sandalwood was imposed on every adult native to meet these claims, which even this failed to satisfy, and which were compromised for a much smaller sum years afterwards. The American sailors and American missionaries thus settled their quarrels at the expense of their Polynesian hosts.

The same year saw the beginning of the Catholic mission in Hawaii, which was the first in Oceanica. Two priests—M. Bachelot, a native of France, and Father P. Short, an Irishman educated in the same country—were sent out with two lay brothers, both mechanics, by the Society of Picpus, a congregation established in Paris for foreign missions. The queen and the Protestant ministers soon displayed a strong spirit of hostility towards the Catholic religion, which was favorably received by many of the natives. In 1829 the natives were forbidden by the queen to attend Catholic worship and the priests prohibited from receiving them into the Church or even into their houses. How much of religious fanaticism was involved in this step, as far as the chiefs were concerned, may be gathered from the answer given by Boki, the governor of Oahei, to an English captain who remonstrated against such a display of religious intolerance. Boki declared that the islands were too small for two religions, and that as they had already taken one, they could not tolerate the existence of another. He added that if the Catholics had come first, the chiefs would just as readily have adopted their creed. The Christianity of the Methodist converts may be estimated at its full value from this remark.

The old queen, at the express advice of Mr. Bingham, as she acknowledged herself, took active measures to exterminate Catholicity from her dominions. In 1830 a number of natives were arrested on the sole charge of being Catholics and sentenced to hard labor on building the fort of Honolulu. Men and women alike were included in this sentence, though mat-making was sometimes assigned to the women as their task. One woman who was nursing her infant child died in prison in consequence, and when the others had served out their sentence they were allowed to return home. The following year Kahumanu renewed the persecution. Nine Catholic men and women, including one of the chiefs, Esther Uhete, were thrown into prison and sentenced to hard labor. Several more were subsequently arrested, and all were offered liberty if they would attend the Protestant services, but all steadily refused. Fathers Bachelot and Short were expelled by force on Christmas eve of the same year, and sent in a whaler to California, then a province of Mexico.

The Catholics already arrested were kept in prison for eighteen months, and were repeatedly urged to accept Protestantism as the price of their liberty. Finally an attempt was made to put them in chains—a special degradation of the lowest criminals in Hawaii. Esther Uhete, as a chief by birth, protested so vigorously against this outrage that her jailers got alarmed and agreed to allow her an appeal to the Council of Chiefs. The

English consul also interfered in their behalf, and the young king, who exercised joint authority with Kahumanu, finally liberated them. Several died shortly afterwards from the effects of their confinement and the abuse inflicted on them.

Kahumanu died in 1832, and was succeeded as queen by Kinau, a daughter of Kamehameha I. Her brother, Kamehameha III., was already in power, and thus the double sovereignty established since the death of the founder of the kingdom was continued. The young king was not as enthusiastic a disciple of the Protestant missionaries as his stepmother and sister, and in March, 1833, he abolished most of the regulations which had been established under the old queen. At Mr. Bingham's suggestion, the laws against ordinary crimes remained, but the Hawaiian blue laws were abolished, and attendance at the Protestant churches or schools was left to the discretion of each individual. A widespread defection from these institutions was the immediate result and a remarkable proof of how artificial a thing was the supposed conversion of Hawaii. Boki, the governor of Oahu, who had been one of the zealots against Fathers Bachelot and Short, openly returned to the old pagan rites, and on the death of a favorite daughter he had her funeral celebrated with the traditional heathen ceremonies and license.

The young king, however, soon fell under the ascendancy of his more energetic sister and allowed the Protestant penal code to be restored. Their missionaries received reinforcements from the United States and England, and in 1835 they counted no less than a hundred and forty-three in the Hawaiian group. The same year the persecution of the native Catholics was renewed. A new and disgusting punishment was invented for them—that of acting as scavengers for the fort and jail. Two women were sentenced to this vile work, and they were even obliged to carry off the filth in their bare hands. Other Catholics were taken by force to the Protestant prayer-meetings; and in October, 1835, six professing Catholics, five of whom had not yet been baptized, were sentenced to the same punishment as the first two prisoners. The one baptized Catholic was chained down by neck, hands, and feet to a mat in the prison as a punishment for his faith, but none of the prisoners would consent to abandon their faith. The foreign population, though mostly non-Catholic, grew indignant at these disgraceful scenes, and some of them remonstrated strongly with Kinau, but to no purpose. In June, 1838, six Christians more were arrested, and on their refusal to abandon the Catholic faith they were condemned to penal servitude on the public works for life. Three were women, and it is a striking example of the zeal for morality which actuated the dominant Protestant

element that these three were specially ordered to be put to labor in company with common prostitutes.

In the meantime the two exiled priests had determined to return to Hawaii, and they arrived there in March, 1837, on the brig *Clementine*. They landed unmolested, but on the following day Father Bachelot was ordered by Kinau to re-embark on the *Clementine*. The owner, M. Dudoit, a Frenchman, refused to carry him away against his own will, and after a long discussion the two priests were put on board by an armed force, the guns of the fort being trained on the vessel to compel obedience. M. Dudoit then took the crew off and brought his flag to the English consul, his vessel being under English colors. Before the consul he lodged a formal protest against the violence offered him, but at first in vain. The two priests were detained on the *Clementine* over a month, until an English frigate arrived in Honolulu. The captain, Sir Edward Belcher, took them off, but only on a promise that they should leave on the first convenient vessel. Father Short sailed for Valparaiso on the 2d of November, and a few days later M. Bachelot and Mgr. Maigret, afterwards Bishop of Honolulu, who had arrived during the year, took passage on a schooner for Ascension Island. M. Bachelot had contracted a fever, and died a few days after reaching the lonely island where he found a resting-place. Father Maigret was the only one near him at his premature death at the age of forty-one.

The violence of the Hawaiian government against the Catholic Church, however, was not to last much longer. In 1839 the French frigate *Artemise* arrived in Honolulu and presented a formal demand in the name of the French government for liberty of conscience throughout Hawaii and the release of the Catholics in prison for their faith. Neither the king nor his missionary advisers ventured to refuse this demand, and after some deliberation it was proclaimed that all persecution of Catholics should be ended. Several priests who were on the *Artemise* at once landed and resumed the long interrupted work commenced by Fathers Bachelot and Short. The growth of the Church among the natives was very rapid in spite of the ill-will which still continued to be shown towards Catholicity by the Protestant chiefs. In a few years the Catholic population amounted to twelve thousand, and somewhat later the Catholics were estimated by Mgr. Maigret at over twenty-three thousand, a full third of the then existing population, while another third professed no religion but their ancestral paganism. The persecution of Kahumanu and the Calvinist missionaries has been another monument of the powerlessness of human intolerance against the Church of God.

Though Mr. Bingham and his colleagues were thus compelled

to allow freedom of conscience to the natives, they continued to exercise an increasing influence with the king and chiefs. This influence extended to matters rather different from those for which missionaries are usually supposed to be sent. The king was advised to form his government on a European model instead of the old native system. Mr. Richards, the same minister who had received the favorable report of Captain Jones in 1826, undertook to devote himself to the duties of a constitutional lawyer instead of a preacher of the gospel. He abandoned mission work in 1839 to fill the position of legal adviser to the king, and delivered a series of law lectures in Honolulu to instruct the natives in the benefits and methods of a constitutional monarchy. It does not appear that the Hawaiians comprehended the latter fully, but a ministry was established to replace the Council of Chiefs. The natives not being familiar with modern diplomacy, the new ministers were all recruited from the missionaries and their families, or from friends who had followed them from the United States.

A land law was the next innovation. Under the Polynesian system the king was regarded as the sole proprietor of land, and he made grants of districts to his chiefs for life, they, in turn, subletting them to the lower class of cultivators. Rents were paid in produce to the chiefs by their tenants, and to the king by the chiefs. In a general way the Polynesian system had a resemblance to that which prevailed in Europe in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and it offered a good deal of protection to the farming classes in the possession of their lands. The missionary advisers of the king, however, pointed out how different it was from the usages of countries like America and England, and the facilities for commercial enterprise which might be obtained by the adoption of the latter. Accordingly, a new law was framed by which the king retained a third of the land in absolute property; a third was granted to the sub-chiefs as separate estates, and a third was left to the actual cultivators. As only a small part of the soil was actually under cultivation, this system enabled enterprising individuals to acquire large tracts on easy terms, and the missionary adherents supplied the largest proportion of enterprising individuals then in the islands. A landed aristocracy of planters, many of them belonging to the missionary families, is now established, while the land has passed out of possession of the natives without any foreign conquest or visible compensation.

The king's third of the land was subsequently divided into two parts, one of which was retained for the private benefit of the sovereign and his family, and the other declared national property. Long before this, however, Mr. Richards, the ex-missionary, in his capacity of legal adviser to Kamehameha IV., made a contract

with the firm of Ladd & Co. in 1841, giving them the privilege of leasing any unoccupied land at a nominal rent. Mr. Richards became a partner in the firm, and subsequently transferred its interests to the Royal Belgian Company, of which he was a director. The arrangement was made in 1843, during Mr. Richards' embassy to Europe to secure the recognition of Hawaii as an independent State by England and France. It was afterwards complained that the contract with the Belgian Company, so-called, virtually gave it a monopoly of the whole foreign trade of Hawaii, and deprived the native population at a stroke of the greatest part of the land of their country. A settlement was finally effected by which the contract was annulled, but compensation was made to the concessionaires. It is to be presumed that the lawyer-missionary did not go wholly unrewarded in a financial point for his disinterested efforts to bring the Hawaiian people up to the standard of modern civilization.

The organization of a public treasury was effected in 1842, and another missionary, the Rev. Dr. Judd, was appointed treasurer. In fact, no native was admitted to any ministerial office under Kamehameha III. Under his successor, six members of the ministry were foreigners, mainly of the missionary colony, and the heir to the throne was the only native who received a portfolio. Under the rule of Kamehameha V. and Lunalilo, no natives were called to high public office, though it was claimed that the Hawaiian population had been Christian for nearly two generations. If the missionaries had not succeeded in the conversion of souls, they certainly had in securing the largest part of the wealth of the islands for themselves and their families.

The regular administration of law according to the practice of the United States, instead of its being applied by the native chiefs, was another point strongly impressed on the king's mind. A lawyer who had landed from Oregon was installed as chief-justice at a handsome salary about 1847. Of course familiarity with the legal practices of American courts was regarded by the missionaries as much more necessary for the proper administration of justice than any mere familiarity with the customs or rights of the Hawaiian people. The new chief-justice, we believe, gave every satisfaction to the missionary element, and if the natives did not thrive under the new *régime*, it was not regarded as of any special consequence. The missionaries had made them nominally Christians, and they could not be expected to also teach them how to protect their worldly interests in the field of civilized life.

Towards 1850 the American Mission Board withdrew from further control over the Hawaiian missions, it being alleged that

the latter were now able to maintain themselves. This was certainly quite true as far as their white teachers were concerned. In fact the latter had now so many duties, political and commercial to perform that merely clerical work was, in a great degree, left to the natives themselves. Though not regarded as sufficiently instructed to manage their own government or temporal affairs, their teachers thought them fully competent to be their own guides in religious matters. The fact that the financial resources of the islands had in a great degree passed from native hands may possibly have had something to do with this withdrawal of religious guidance as well as the extraordinary decrease in population which had accompanied the *régime* of the foreign Protestant missionaries.

The decrease was certainly noteworthy and is the most striking comment on the value of Protestant mission work in benefiting the heathen world. In 1830, ten years after the arrival of Messrs. Bingham and Thurston, and when the whole of Hawaii was nominally converted a census was taken, which gave the population at one hundred and thirty thousand three hundred. Though this was much less than the estimated numbers in the time of Kamehameha the First, the decrease might, with some appearance of likelihood be attributed to the wars of that chief and to the barbarities of heathenism. A similar result had been observed by the Catholic missionaries of the Gambier Islands and Wallis at their first arrival there previous to 1840. The native population was everywhere represented as having been nearly double its then numbers a couple of generations earlier, and the same was doubtless the case in Hawaii. In the latter islands however, under the sway of the Calvinist missionaries the decrease continued more rapidly than if they were decimated by the fiercest wars. A census taken in 1836 only showed little over a hundred and eight thousand natives and in 1850, though there were less than two thousand foreigners on the islands, the numbers had fallen to eighty-four thousand. Shortly afterwards the first appearance of leprosy was noted and it has since continued to extend its ravages. In 1890 the whole native population including half-breeds was little over forty-one thousand, a decrease to nearly a quarter of its original numbers under the missionary sway.

So alarming was the disappearance of population to the planters, who had now become the practically controlling power, that various projects were set on foot for encouraging foreign immigration. A large number of Portuguese laborers were first brought over, between 1865 and 1872, and at present the Portuguese form nearly two thirds of the foreign population of the

white race. A more subservient class of laborers however, soon commended itself to the planters, and Chinese and Japanese have since been imported on a contract system of labor or peonage. The census of 1890 gave in round numbers the whole population at little over thirty-eight thousand of the native race, three thousand half-breeds, eight thousand six hundred Portuguese, four thousand three hundred Americans, English, Germans, French and other Europeans, about seventy-five hundred Hawaiians of foreign origin and twenty-eight thousand Chinese and Japanese. Though the latter are of course as much heathens as were the Hawaiians of seventy years ago, it does not appear that the Protestant missionaries have set any special effort on foot for their conversion. The necessities of commerce are doubtless too absorbing to permit of such an application of missionary energy at the present time.

What makes the destruction of the Hawaiians under the Protestant missions and civilization the more remarkable is the present condition of the populations of the same race, who had the good fortune to fall under the sole influence of the Catholic Church. The Gambier Islands and Wallis and Futana in the South Pacific are a striking contrast to-day with Hawaii. In the first named group the condition of affairs, when Catholic missionaries landed there, at the very time when their colleagues were forbidden to enter Hawaii, was almost identically the same as in the kingdom of Kamehameha. The race was the same, with similar language, institutions, and superstitions. Shortly before, an energetic chief had brought the four islands under one ruler, as Kamehameha did in Hawaii. Cannibalism and the tabu had full sway in Gambier as in the larger group, and the visits of foreign ships and the demoralization consequent on intercourse with worthless members of the civilized world were as well known to the Gambiers as to Honolulu. The Catholic priests were received by the natives as Bingham and Thurston were by Kahumanu, and the whole population received baptism within a few years.

Their teachers, however, were far from counting their work ended with the baptism of their converts. They introduced habits of labor hitherto unknown, as the old monastic apostles of northern Europe had done a thousand years ago, and they taught by word and example the necessity of Christian morality as well as Christian faith. They did not, it is true, attempt to change the policy or national customs of the natives where consistent with Christianity, nor did they seek to build up a tinsel imitation of a European kingdom or secure the lands of the islands for commercial development; but under the sway of the Catholic Church

the native population has steadily grown in numbers and in material prosperity, and at the present moment they form the only branch of the Polynesian race which can be fairly said to live and thrive.

To briefly sum up the results of the Protestant missions in Hawaii, it can be said that getting practical control, both intellectual and political, of a heathen race seeking for religious instruction, they have only succeeded in building up a wealthy colony of a few hundred planters and merchants in the islands they professed to evangelize. The population whose conversion was their nominal object has welcomed them, and in two generations it has all but perished. The survivors, for the greater part, have rejected any form of the doctrines they once received so readily, and where they have not received the Catholic faith they have practically ceased to be Christians. This, at least, is the burthen of the complaints of the descendants of the missionaries against the native ruler whose throne they have lately overturned for their own benefit. This may be enterprise or business success, but it is not Christianizing a nation; and Hawaii is a striking example of the long asserted fact that to the Catholic Church, and to her alone, belongs the true mission work of Christianity.

BRYAN. J. CLINCHE.

THE TRUE ACCOUNT OF THE MURDER OF ARCHBISHOP SEGHERS.

[Rev. Francis Barnum, S. J., a Missionary in Alaska, having been convinced that all published accounts of the death of the heroic Archbishop Seghers were defective, and in many minor points inaccurate, has exerted himself during the last two years to ascertain on the spot, and, as far as possible, from eye-witnesses, all the details of the last days of the saintly prelate. This sketch is now published as valuable material for the future historian.]

IT is necessary in order to present a full and clear account of this lamentable occurrence, to review very briefly the events connected with the foundation of the Catholic mission in the Territory of Alaska.

* * * * *

In the year 1875 the Rt. Rev. J. Clut, O.M.T., Bishop of Athabaska (Mackenzie), made a long journey through Alaska. He entered the Territory by way of the Porcupine River at the head-waters of which, near a trading post known as La Pierre's House, there is a portage to the Mackenzie. On arriving at Nukloroyet, he joined the traders, Messrs. Harper and McQuestin, with whom he descended the Yukon. Bishop Clut sailed from St. Michael's for San Francisco, but he left his companion in Alaska, who wintered at a little place in the Yukon delta, called Kutlik. Bishop Seghers having the jurisdiction over Alaska, wrote to Rome in respect to this, and Bishop Clut received a note of disapproval.

* * * * *

In the year 1877 Bishop Seghers, accompanied by the Rev. J. Mandart, made a preliminary visit of observation to Alaska, with the view of founding a mission there. They sailed from San Francisco on the steamer of the Alaska Commercial Company, and landed at St. Michael's on Norton Sound. They started to reach the Yukon, *via* Unalaklik River, at the head of which there is a portage. They were occupied during six days in this toilsome labor, as the portage is long, and they had to carry all their goods themselves. They ran out of provisions, and were forced to *live on crows*.

There was a box of books among their things, and as it was very heavy, they resolved to *cache* it. Later on, when coming down the Yukon, the archbishop spoke of this to Father Tosi, and said that he still remembered the exact spot in the portage where he had buried this box of books. They reached the

Yukon just as the boats of the traders were passing up. They made signals, but only the last boat perceived them. This belonged to a man named Jean Baudouin, who took the party on board and brought them to Nulato, where they arrived on the 5th of August.

The bishop bought a little log-cabin from an Indian named Kereka. The price of this episcopal residence was ten dollars. This house was afterwards washed away by one of the summer floods. They endured many great privations during the winter; neither of them had the least skill in cooking, and they were unable to make bread. They visited a great deal of the country, and when the river opened they returned to St. Michael's. Before leaving Nulato the bishop assembled the Indians, and assured them that he would return the following year, and found a permanent mission there. On reaching Victoria, B. C., disappointing news awaited him. He found that he had been promoted to the Archiepiscopal See of Portland, Oregon, and this obliged him to relinquish his arrangements regarding Alaska.

* * * * *

In 1883 Archbishop Seghers, accompanied by the Rev. P. F. Hylebos, visited the Eternal City, and obtained permission from the Supreme Pontiff to return to Victoria, which See was then vacant. He was accordingly reappointed to his former diocese on March 7, 1884, and immediately resumed his long-delayed plans for a mission on the Yukon. His inability to fulfil the promise which he had made to the Indians of Nulato had always been a source of deep regret to him, and he often spoke of it. However, it was not until 1886 that the archbishop was finally able to put his project into execution. It was his wish that the new mission should be confided to the care of a religious order. With this view he applied to several without success, but finally the Jesuit Fathers of the Rocky Mountain Mission agreed to accept it. Two fathers were detailed by the Superior General, the Rev. J. M. Caltaldo, to proceed to Victoria. When the steamer on which they were was due, the archbishop watched for it from the cupola of his residence. As soon as he descried it entering the harbor, he hastened down to the dock. He was the first on board, and ran to embrace the two priests.

On the 13th of July, 1886, Archbishop Seghers embarked on the steamer *Ancon*, accompanied by the Rev. Pascal Tosi and the Rev. Aloysius Robaut, of the Society of Jesus. The archbishop wrote to Cardinal Simeoni informing him of his intention of setting out for Alaska, and this letter was mailed on the morning of the departure of the party. The *Ancon* sailed from Victoria at noon. The commander, Captain Carroll, not only showed the

archbishop's party every possible attention during the voyage, but, moreover, insisted upon defraying the expenses of their passage in order to testify his interest in their undertaking.

They had a hired attendant with them named Francis Fuller. This man had been employed at De Smet Mission in Idaho, where he had heard about the Alaskan enterprise, and expressed a desire to join it. He was subject to hallucinations, and constantly imagined he was pursued by enemies. Father Tosi had objected very strongly to having Fuller in the party on this account, but he was overruled by the archbishop, who said: "That when once in Alaska Fuller would certainly believe himself to be in safety." Nevertheless, the *Ancon* had scarcely left the dock when Fuller told Father Robaut that his enemies had succeeded in following him up, and were then actually on board of the steamer.

The *Ancon* arrived at Juneau, July 19th, where she remained one day. The party called on Father Altoff, the parish priest, and on his recommendation the archbishop engaged a Canadian named Antoine Prevost to accompany them as cook. The next day the *Ancon* reached Chilcat, the terminus of the route. Here the party took leave of Captain Carroll, and entered upon the difficult portion of their long journey.

Their course to the head-waters of the Yukon led across the mountain-range, and this they were obliged to traverse on foot. At the Chilcat trading-post, which is generally known as Healey's Place, a number of Indians were engaged to carry the provisions of the party over the "Divide." The chief turned out to be most arrogant and unreasonable. A discussion arose concerning some detail of the contract, in which the chief became very insolent, and gesticulated with his forefinger so close to the face of the archbishop as to oblige him to move backwards several times. Healey, fearing that some trouble might arise, got his rifle, and calling to the white men around, said: "Look out, boys! If he touches the archbishop I will shoot him!" This is the origin of the report that the archbishop had received from the Indians a slap in the face. During their passage up the mountains the party had to ford a number of glacial streams. Five of these were very deep and wide, and, of course, icy cold. At one the archbishop had a most narrow escape from being carried off by the current. On the 26th of July they reached Crater Lake, which is one of the sources of the Yukon. The archbishop mentions this as a coincidence, for his first view of the Yukon in 1877 was also on this same date.

On reaching Lake Lindeman they set about building a raft. One day while engaged at this work, Father Tosi went to where Prevost was cooking to get some scraps for an Indian. Prevost com-

plaining of neuralgia, Father Tosi told him to go to the tent and try to sleep, adding that he would call him in time to prepare supper. At four o'clock Father Tosi went to call him as he had promised, but there was no sign of Prevost. He walked around the little camp shouting for him. The archbishop was a short distance away, reading his breviary, and he, too, began to call for Prevost. Father Tosi took his gun and went on a longer circuit, firing frequently. At two o'clock the next morning he arose and went back about ten miles, but without success. Two miners, named Burke and S. Wade, joined in the search. For three days they waited and sought, and then concluded that the man had deserted. Notice was sent back to Healey's, but nothing was ever heard of Prevost. He was a despondent man, who had failed in business. He took nothing with him at the time of his disappearance except a small revolver of the bull-dog pattern. This occurrence gave the archbishop much distress.

When the raft was finished, they loaded it up and floated down to the outlet of the lake. The stream connecting with the next lake, consists of a series of rapids, which necessitates a portage. At Lake Lindeman the archbishop's party had joined a number of prospectors, and when they arrived at Lake Bennet, an arrangement was made, that the archbishop's party would transport all the provisions over the portage, and in return for this service, the miners would build a scow for them. They were occupied during ten days with this severe labor, as there were fully 5000 pounds weight to be transported.

After a delay of several weeks, a clumsy scow was constructed, in which they started on their perilous voyage. The many exciting incidents of this arduous journey, and the terrible privations endured, have been already made known. After passing the chain of lakes, they descended the Lewes River to the famous Miles Cañon, one of the great natural wonders of Alaska. Once more they had to carry all their goods across the portage, and then came the exciting episode of running their empty boat through the Cañon. Fuller was at the helm and Father Robaut attended the oars. Just as the boat was ready, the archbishop stepped in and seated himself in the bow, with his watch in his hand. The rest of the party protested against his exposing himself to the danger, but he was too bold a leader to be deterred by peril. In fact the archbishop never seemed to care what risks he ran.¹ Word being given, the boat started and in an instant it was swept off by the foaming waters into the gloomy recesses of

¹ "I would not see my own party jeopardize their lives without sharing their danger."—*Letter to Father Jonckau.*

the Cañon. After a fearful transit, which lasted three minutes and twenty-five seconds, the boat happily reached the quiet pool far below. On the 7th of September the party reached the trading post of Harper, which is at the junction of Lewes and Stewart's. They found some fifty prospectors camped here for the winter.

Here the unfortunate decision was made, that the party should divide. The reasons which led to this hasty determination are as follows; Harper informed the archbishop that a Rev. Mr. Parker, with his wife and family, were then at St. Michael's, and that they were coming up the river in the summer to settle at Nulato. This news produced a great effect upon the archbishop. He had already passed a winter at Nulato, and had promised the Indians there to return to them. He was, therefore, intensely eager to reach there without the least delay. On the other hand, he felt that he ought not to neglect the interests of those Indians along the upper portion of the river. The only solution appeared to be a division of the party. Father Tosi, as well as Father Robaut, was greatly opposed to the idea, but submitted to the wish of the archbishop. It was accordingly settled that the two priests should remain at Harper's till the spring, and that then they should proceed to Nukloroyet. The archbishop and Fuller were to endeavor to reach Nulato, a distance of 1100 miles, if possible before the river closed; if this could not be accomplished they were to finish the journey on sleds. So impatient was the archbishop to arrive at Nulato that on the following day, September 8, 1886, after having said Mass, he set out. Tears were flowing from his eyes, when the two priests knelt before him for his parting blessing. As the skiff was pushed off from the shore, Father Tosi's last words were, "Fuller, take good care of the archbishop." The swift current bore the boat rapidly away. It was their last sight of their zealous noble-hearted saintly leader, Charles Seghers, whose life-blood was soon to mingle in the icy waters of that mighty river, which for so many years had been the constant goal of all his aspirations.

* * * * *

Before leaving Harper's place, the archbishop took advantage of an opportunity afforded by a miner, who was returning, to send a letter to Victoria. This letter was addressed to his Vicar-General, Very Rev. J. J. Jonckau, and contained a full account of the journey thus far. In it the archbishop made several allusions to Fuller, always styling him "Brother Fuller." Fuller never was a coadjutor brother in the Society of Jesus, and the archbishop, who was most intimate with the Jesuits of the Rocky

Mountain Mission, was well aware of this ; nevertheless, through his kindness of heart he generally gave Fuller that title.

* * * * *

It was already far too late in the season to attempt so long a trip on the river, for it must be remembered that their route through this desolate frigid region, extended within the limits of the Arctic Circle. The archbishop experienced immense difficulties, as his little boat was constantly in danger of being crushed by the great masses of floating ice, and over and over again they narrowly escaped destruction. Finally, when well-nigh worn out by privation, cold, and fatigue, they succeeded in reaching the trading post of Nukloroyet.¹ This was as far as it was possible for them to go, and so they were obliged to delay until the river closed and sufficient snow fell to render it suitable for sled-travel.

About this time Fuller became very morose, and began to act with the greatest insolence towards the archbishop. Fuller soon became very intimate with the trader, whose name was Walker. There were two prospectors wintering at the port, and Fuller used to talk a great deal with them, always complaining about the archbishop. Walker was bitterly opposed to Catholic missions in the country, and the sympathy and evil counsels of these men served to render Fuller all the more excitable. The archbishop perceived this, and decided to go to Tozikakat, which is situated at a short distance from Nukloroyet. On arriving there, he wished to erect a small log-cabin, but was thwarted by Fuller who obstinately refused to perform the least work. After a sojourn there of two weeks the party were obliged to return to Nukloroyet. On the way the archbishop noticing that one of the Indians who accompanied them was poorly clad, and suffering, as the weather was exceedingly severe, gave him one of the native fur coats, called a parki. This simple act of generosity was greatly misconstrued by Fuller, who told his friends, on arriving at Nukloroyet, that he had discovered the archbishop bribing the Indians to injure him.

On another occasion Fuller was collecting some firewood, and, meeting with the miners, he began to complain of having such work to do. They told him not to work any longer. He then returned to the house, and told the archbishop if he needed firewood to go and cut it himself, then breaking out into a violent passion he seized a rifle and aimed it at the archbishop. The prelate rose up perfectly calm, and folding his arms stood erect

¹ Badly rendered on the maps as Nuklukahyet.

with his eyes fixed upon Fuller, who lowered the weapon and went out.

Archbishop Seghers, now fully convinced that he was no longer safe in company with Fuller, endeavored to persuade Walker to go with him as far as Nulato. As Walker would not consent, he then did all in his power to prevail upon one of the miners to accompany him. His entreaties and offers were in vain; their sympathies were with Fuller, and both refused to go. Finding it hopeless to obtain another white companion, the archbishop set out with two Indians, named Sen-né-toh and Koi-ha-toy, who attended to the dog-teams. Fuller's insolent behavior continued. At Melozikakat, the trader, a Russian named Korkorin, was so indignant at the manner in which Fuller acted that he said afterwards "that if it had not been on account of his age and infirmities he himself would have gone with the archbishop."

The journey to Nulato by sled usually occupies ten days, and was drawing near its close. It was a Friday evening when the party camped for the last time on the bank of the frozen river. Only a short day's travel yet remained, and the archbishop, who was eager to arrive at Nulato for Sunday, speaking of this, remarked: "God be praised! it is the last day." Fuller said afterwards that he supposed the archbishop meant by this that it was the last day for him, thinking that the archbishop was going to kill him.

The spot where this last camp of Archbishop Seghers was made is near the base of a lofty point jutting out from the north bank of the river. It is known as Yis-setla-toh or Wolf-head Point, and is not very far above the place where the Koi-klot-zena¹ enters the Yukon. The Indian guides expected to find a barrabara here, but they made the mistake of looking for it along the north bank. They discovered, however, one of the little summer cabins, such as are occupied during the salmon fishery, and it was in this miserable, deserted hut that the apostle of Alaska met his death.

A native Alaskan house is one of the most wretched dwellings used by men. It consists merely of a square pit covered with a rough roof of sods, in the centre of which is a smoke-hole. The fire is made on the floor, and around three sides the ground is left a few inches higher, thus forming the sleeping-places. The interior is always dark, damp, ill-ventilated, and indescribably filthy. The archbishop spread the bear-skin which formed his travelling bed on one of the ledges. The two Indians occupied the opposite one, while Fuller slept near the archbishop. He arose at a very early hour and secured his rifle, which was at the

¹ This tributary appears on the map under the corruption of Koyukuk.

bottom of his sled, and came back to the house. Next he busied himself at the fire, and then awakened Koihatoy and sent him to fill the teakettle with ice. Sennetoh, who was also awake, had his head still under the blanket, when he heard Fuller kick the archbishop and tell him to get up.¹ At this rude summons the archbishop sat up. He wore a squirrel-skin parki, and had just passed an arm through a sleeve when Fuller, pointing his rifle at him, fired the fatal shot. The bullet entered the heart, and death was instantaneous. The archbishop had not uttered a word from the moment he was awakened. Sennetoh instantly sprang up, and wrested the rifle from Fuller's hands just as he was about to fire a second time. At that moment Koihatoy came running in, and both the Indians asked Fuller if he intended to kill them also. He replied: "No; I only wanted to kill that bad man." The body was left just as it had fallen, and the three men went on down to Nulato.

There the news immediately created an intense excitement. The Indians were just departing for a hunting expedition when they heard it, so they all returned at once to the village. The archbishop had made himself so much beloved during his stay that they were furious at hearing that he was murdered while returning to them. They decided at once to shoot Fuller, and would have certainly carried out their intention had it not been for the interference of the trader. When these Nulato Indians afterwards heard the result of the trial at Sitka they greatly regretted that they had allowed themselves to be influenced. On the other hand, the Koiklotzena Indians considered that Fuller was right because the white men let him off.

During the winter of 1877-78, when the archbishop was at Nulato, he lived, as has been already stated, in a house belonging to an Indian named Kereka. This man was particularly devoted to the archbishop, and as soon as he heard of the murder he took his dog-team, and accompanied by a man named Vanka (John) started up to Yissetlatoh to bring back the body. Fuller went along with them. In the meanwhile, a half-breed woman living across the river at the barrabora where the archbishop had expected to stop, having heard the report of the rifle, went over on the following day to see what had happened. She discovered the body, but seeing that it was a white man, she was frightened and said nothing about it. The lower extremities were covered with

¹ Some accounts have it that Fuller said: "One of us two has to die, and you are best prepared." If so, Fuller himself must have stated this later, since the *only* witness of the murder was Sennetoh, and it is not likely that he, knowing only a few common words of English, could have reported the above expression.

snow, which she brushed away, and then spread the blanket carefully over it.¹

When Kereka arrived, the field-mice which abound in Alaska had gnawed away the flesh above the eyes. The Indians imagined at first that this was the mark of the bullet. This gave rise to the erroneous report that the archbishop had been shot in the forehead. The body was brought down to Nulato, and it remained for one day in the sled until a coffin was made, which was done by an Indian called Vaska (Basil). The blood-stained breviary of the archbishop was also enclosed in the coffin, which was then deposited in an outhouse of the trading-post, where it remained two weeks before it was forwarded to St. Michael's. In the meantime, the two guides Sennetoh and Koihatoy had returned to Nukloroyet.

During the time spent at Nulato, Frederickson, whose sympathies were all with Fuller, allowed him full possession of the archbishop's effects. Fuller first read the diary of the archbishop, but every reference to him was written in French; however, he must have noticed the following entry: "To-day I wrote to Father Cataldo." This letter, which would be apt to contain some allusions to him, must have been abstracted, for it was not found with the various other letters which the archbishop had ready to be mailed at St. Michael's, and which were all mentioned in the diary. The archbishop had a general letter of introduction from the central office of the Alaska Commercial Company in San Francisco to the various local agents. Fuller took this, saying that it would be needed by him at St. Michael's.

A train of three sleds set out from Nulato to convey the body to St. Michael's. With one sled were Fuller and a miner known as Peter Johnson. Two Indians, To-nul-toh and Manuska,² had the second. The third sled, which bore the coffin, was drawn by six dogs, and was conducted by the faithful Kereka and Vanka. During the winter, communication between Nulato and St. Michael's is carried on by a route leading directly across the country to Unalaklik on Norton Sound, and from there across the Sound to the island on which St. Michael's is situated. This journey lasts generally from eight to ten days. On arriving at St. Michael's they were met by Henry Neuman, the chief agent of the A. C. Co. Fuller's first words to him were: "I have brought Archbishop Seghers." Neuman looked around and then asked: "Where is he?" Fuller answered: "He is here in a sled; I have killed him." He then presented the letter of introduction,

¹ This same woman was present on the occasion when the Jesuit Fathers erected a memorial cross at Yis-setla toh, Aug. 28, 1892.

² Properly Vanuska, a Russian diminutive of Ivan (John), as Johnny.

and announced that the killing had been done in self-defence. The same remarkable success still attended him. His statement was readily accepted; *he was made welcome and admitted to the table of the officers of the trading station.*

One of the clerks, however, displayed considerable indignation. This man's name is Waldron and he is from the State of New York. For many years he has been in the employ of the Fur Co., and knows these Indians perfectly. It is to Mr. Waldron's credit that he positively refused to accept Fuller's statements. He said to him, "I do not know you or anything about this case, but I say that there are not goods enough in this warehouse to bribe an Indian to kill a white man, who had never injured him." Nevertheless, Fuller had the effrontery to exhibit a couple of little sacks containing sugar and tea, which he declared were bribes given by the archbishop to induce an Indian to kill him. Fuller used to talk a great deal with Mr. Waldron, and seemed most anxious to convince him that the archbishop had been fully determined to kill him, and that the act was only legitimate self-defence. Waldron demanded to be informed what proofs Fuller had of the archbishop's intention. Fuller's reply was "that just as they were starting from Harper's place he overheard Father Tosi whisper to the archbishop, 'Be sure and make away with that man, Fuller, before you get down to Nulato.'" During another conversation with Waldron, when asked if he was in holy orders, Fuller replied, "No, I am not good enough yet to be made a priest; after a few years I will be." He said also "that the fact of shooting the archbishop did not trouble his conscience in the least, but that he always felt much remorse for a thing which he had done some years before." When asked what this was, he abruptly changed the subject and left the room.

The rough coffin was enclosed in zinc and deposited in the old Russian church. Mr. Waldron made this zinc case in which the coffin was enclosed. Just as they were ready to place the coffin in it, Fuller strongly insisted upon opening the coffin in order to dress the body in the episcopal robes, but the agent, Mr. Neuman, positively refused to permit this be done.

While at St. Michael's Fuller wrote a letter to Walker informing him of what he had done, as Walker had said to him, "Get rid of that man and it will be the end of the Catholics in this country."¹

¹ In the summer, when a little steamer, which brought down the various traders, reached Nukloroyet, Walker showed this letter to Harper and also to a Rev. Mr. Ellington, an Anglican minister from the Mackenzie. Both declared positively that the letter contained the most damaging evidence. Mr. Ellington asserted, "That according to the laws of England this letter was sufficient to hang Fuller without any further testimony."

Walker answered Fuller's letter, and he also was equally incautious in his remarks. He realized it too late and said several times that "he would give a thousand dollars to have his letter back." When Walker reached St. Michael's, some misunderstanding arose between the two, and Fuller threatened the former saying: "Remember that if you do not keep your word and help me through, I have your letter still." Walker being alarmed, a compromise was effected and the two men exchanged and destroyed their incriminating letters.

When Fuller arrived at St. Michael's an Episcopalian minister with his wife and family, and also a schoolmistress, were wintering at the agency. This was the Rev. Mr. Parker, of whom Harper had spoken, when the archbishop arrived at his place. The ladies were rendered so very nervous by the presence of the murderer, that Agent Neuman decided to send Fuller away.

A Canadian, named Jean Beaudouin, who was better known as Johnny, was then at St. Michael's in the employ of the company. He was a former pupil of St. Mary's College, Montreal. During the archbishop's first visit, Beaudouin had met him and rendered him much service. Neuman appointed Johnny to conduct Fuller to Andreieffski, where he was to pass the remainder of the winter. This was the nearest post, and is on the Yukon at the head of the delta. Johnny related that while they were at Andreieffski, every Friday night Fuller would have fearful attacks of frenzy. During these paroxysms he would run around the house screaming that he had to reach Nulato in time for Sunday. When the ice broke, Johnny who was engineer of one of the river-boats belonging to the company, brought Fuller along with him, on his trip to Anvik, whither he went to meet the traders, and convey them to St. Michael's.

* * * * *

During all this time Fathers Tosi and Robaut had remained at Harper's place, near the mouth of the Stewart River. They endured the utmost privations. The cold was very great, often reaching eighty degrees below zero. As soon as the river opened, they set out for Nukloroyet, according to their instructions, where they expected to rejoin the archbishop. On their way down, when near Fort Yukon, a deserted post of the Hudson Bay Co., they received the appalling news of the murder of their leader. In this terrible emergency, the only thing which remained for them to do, was to continue the journey down to St. Michael's.

They felt confident that another father would arrive in Alaska, as both the archbishop and Father Tosi had urged Father Cataldo to send one. The steamer *Dora* reached St. Michael's June 20, 1887, but no father was on board, and what was still more distressing,

there was not a letter to any one of the party. It was then decided that Father Robaut should remain in Alaska, and that Father Tosi should go down to San Francisco on the return trip of the *Dora*, which sailed June 28, 1887.

Meanwhile, Mr. Parker, the minister who had wintered at St. Michael's, where he met Fuller and surely knew perfectly well that the man was not a priest, had written to Ounalaska, "that one of the priests had assassinated the archbishop." This report was sent overland to Nushagak. Mr. Parker subsequently denied that he wrote this, but thought that his wife did it!

The *Dora* reached Ounalaska about ten o'clock at night. The U. S. Revenue Cutter *Bear* was then in port, and the captain went on board the *Dora* at once to inquire about the assassin of the archbishop. A meeting of the white men was then held in the office of the agent, and Father Tosi made a statement of facts. A warrant for the arrest of Fuller was then made out, and on the following morning the *Bear* sailed for St. Michael's, where she arrived in the afternoon, July 7, 1887. There had been some talk of lynching Fuller, but the scheme failed on account of the small number of whites. As soon as the revenue cutter anchored, a file of marines came ashore in the first boat. They marched up the hill to the agency, and the officer in charge inquired where Fuller was. His tent was pointed out, and when the officer entered it, Fuller was feigning to be asleep. He was handcuffed and brought on board of the cutter. This arrest produced a profound impression upon the simple natives, many of whom were so terrified that they fled from the village.

The *Bear* left St. Michael's the next day, and proceeded on her regular annual cruise to Point Barrow. On her return to Ounalaska, Fuller was transferred to another cutter, called *The Rush*, and taken to Sitka. When the various traders along the Yukon came down to meet the steamers at St. Michael's, in order to deliver their peltry, and to obtain their annual supplies, the precaution had been taken of bringing Sennetoh and Koihatoy. These two men were the only witnesses of the murder. While they were at St. Michael's, awaiting the coming of the *Bear*, Walker, who was determined to prevent them from going to Sitka, succeeded in frightening Koihatoy to such a degree, that the poor simple creature managed to escape to the mainland, and made his way back on foot. Sennetoh, however, remained steadfast, and was taken to Sitka with Fuller.

* * * * *

The remains of the archbishop, which had been deposited in the old Russian church, were an object of much solicitude to the fathers. At the opening of spring, the coffin was moved into

the old fort, as the church was to be demolished. This fort is nothing but a very small octagonal block-house, erected during the Russian period and styled by them a redoubt. St. Michael's Redoubt is the full name by which this post was formerly known. The fathers fully expected that the remains of one so illustrious as the archbishop would be received without difficulty on either of the steamers. Such, however, was not the case. Father Tosi endeavored, in vain, to prevail upon the captains of the *Dora* and the *St. Paul*, but neither would consent to convey the remains to San Francisco.

The last steamer, which called at St. Michael's that season, was the revenue cutter, which came for the arrest of Fuller. Father Robaut, who was then alone (Father Tosi having already departed on the *S. S. Dora*) entreated the captain to transfer the remains, a favor which this officer most bluntly refused to grant. This being the last opportunity of the year, Father Robaut was obliged to bury the body. The funeral took place July 10, 1887 and was attended by all the whites at St. Michael's. The grave was fenced in, and marked with a cross, which was made by a Russian exile, named Romanoff.¹ Father Robaut composed an inscription, and Mr. Greenfield did the lettering on the cross. This gentleman was always most kind and attentive to the fathers, while he remained in Alaska, and all were sorry when he decided to leave the Territory.

Owing to the vigorous measures taken by Col. Robert J. Stevens, U. S. Consul at Victoria, B. C., the Government despatched the following year, a naval vessel called the *Thetis* to convey the remains of Archbishop Seghers to Victoria. It was already very late in the season when the *Thetis* reached Norton Sound. St. Michael's had assumed its lonely winter aspect. The river-boats had long since departed, and the little trading post was deserted by all except the household of the agent. It was September 11, 1888, when the remains were exhumed, and taken on board, and the *Thetis* sailed at once for Victoria, where the last funeral rites were performed November 16, 1888. The commander of the *Thetis*, Captain Emory, won the thanks and esteem of all by the manner in which he carried out his instructions. This gentleman is a devout Catholic. Consul Stevens received a public address of thanks from the clergy and laity of the Diocese of Victoria for his kind offices.

It may be added that Walker had a most miserable ending. He went down to San Francisco in 1891, intending to return to

¹ When the archbishop left St. Michael's after his first visit in 1878, he brought with him a young daughter of Romanoff, and placed her under the care of the Sisters of St. Anne in Victoria, where she still remains.

Alaska the following season, but he died there from excessive dissipation. He had always led a reckless and intemperate life, and his death occurred during a violent attack of delirium tremens. Two of his children remain in the care of the fathers at Holy Cross Mission.

For six years, the ground that had been sanctified by the blood of Archbishop Seghers, the noble-hearted founder of the Alaska Mission, remained undistinguished by monument or other sign. But it was a cherished wish of Father Tosi, the superior of the mission, that some memorial should be erected to mark the spot; and in the year 1892 it was found possible to carry out this design.

As has been said, the site where this terrible event took place is at the base of a lofty point known as Yis-setla-toh or Wolf-head Point. It is on the north bank of the Yukon, at a short distance from where the Koiklotzena (Ko-i-klót-ze-nah) enters the great river. This is one of the most important tributaries of the Yukon and bids fair to surpass the famous Forty Mile Creek, as a gold-bearing district. The name of this river has been distorted into Koyukuk, and is not the only instance Alaskan maps present of slovenly transliteration of native names.

The place where the murder was committed is not far from Nulato. When, therefore, the annual supplies for our mission there were sent up this year, it was considered a favorable opportunity for carrying out Father Tosi's wish concerning a memorial. The supplies for our various stations are distributed by means of a little tow-boat called the *St. Michael*, formerly owned by the Alaska Commercial Company. Father Tosi purchased this steamer, together with three small barges. Through the kindness of Father Sasia, Brother Thomas Power was sent to Alaska to take charge of this steamer. Brother Power is a practical engineer who has served on several steamships running from San Francisco. The greater part of the short Alaskan summer is taken up by the various trips from St. Michael's Post on Norton Sound to the missions along the Yukon. Father Ragaru, who has the direction of the Nulato Mission, had a large cross and pedestal of framework partly finished when the *St. Michael* arrived.

As soon as the freight was discharged, the *St. Michael* set out from Nulato with two barges in tow, carrying the party which had come to assist at the ceremony. Rev. J. Treca, acting superior during the absence of Father Tosi, accompanied by Fathers Ragaru, Robaut and Barnum, occupied one barge. On the second were Sister Mary Prudence and Sister Mary Anguilbert, with seven or eight native girls from our school at Holy Cross. Several of the larger boys of the school were along as assistants on

the steamer. It was late at night when we reached Yis-setla-toh. Owing to a long sand-bar in the river, the steamer had been obliged to run some distance from the exact spot. Early the following morning, Sunday, August 26, 1892, Father Robaut and Father Ragaru hunted around until they found the place where they supposed stood the old barrabora in which the archbishop was killed. We all proceeded to the place which they indicated, and the boys cleared away what little undergrowth there was except one wild rose-bush, which the Sisters wished should remain. A portable altar was arranged, and Father Treca said Mass. When it was concluded, the altar was moved back a few yards, and while Father Ragaru and Father Barnum said Mass, some of the crew were employed in bolting the framework together and setting up the cross. When this was finished, the altar was brought and placed directly in front, and Father Treca performed the ceremony of blessing the cross. He then made a short address, stopping after every sentence, so as to allow one of the boys who stood beside him to interpret what he said. The presence of the steamer had attracted a few straggling Indians who happened to be in the neighborhood. Among them was the woman who had first discovered the body of the archbishop, and who had cleared away the snow and wrapped the blanket over it. When Father Treca ended his address, Father Robaut, who had been the travelling companion of the archbishop, then said Mass. The altar-furniture was then packed up, and having plucked from the little rose-bush a number of leaves as souvenirs of the occasion, the party returned to the boats, and were soon on their way back to Nulato.

THE TRUTH CONCERNING THE DISENFRANCHISEMENT OF CATHOLICS IN RHODE ISLAND.

ALTHOUGH the truth concerning the so-called disenfranchisement of the Catholics in Rhode Island was told nearly a century ago, it does not seem to have made much impression upon the minds of those who are interested in the study of such questions. The inquiry that was issued by Mr. Sidney S. Rider as No. 1 of the second series of the "Rhode Island Historical Tracts," was confined to two hundred and fifty copies, so that its circulation is now naturally restricted to a certain clique of local book collectors. The facts that have been brought to light, however, are of such a nature as to be worthy the attention of every student of American history, and for that reason they are introduced to a wider circulation through the pages of the REVIEW.

The statement that Maryland was the first colony where the ideal policy of religious liberty and freedom of conscience was inculcated, has received general credence. In an address delivered before the Pennsylvania Historical Society in 1882, Mr. William A. Wallace stated that "Maryland was colonized by Roman Catholics, and it is due to truth to say that Calvert, Lord Baltimore, was the first in the history of the Christian world to seek for religious security and peace by the practice of justice and not by the exercise of power."

While we should like to admit that this statement was true, it is but due to historical fact that the credit should be given to Roger Williams. According to Bancroft, the Maryland oath "was devised in 1648, and not before," while, in 1636, Roger Williams wrote, with his own hand, the compact that stands at the head of the first record book of Providence Plantation, and in this preamble each citizen was assured of religious liberty, as he was compelled to bind himself "to be obedient to the orders of the majority *only in civil things.*"

Yet, notwithstanding this compact, the charge has been made and reiterated that as soon as the charter had been obtained and liberty of conscience had been granted to all citizens, regardless of their religious belief, the founders of the colony proceeded to undo their work by enacting a law proscribing the Roman Catholics, denying them the elective franchise and all the rights of citizenship.

If such a charge can be sustained, it introduces Roger Williams

in a new character, for we must admit that no one who was not a hypocrite and an adept in the intricacies of double dealing could ever have been guilty of such inconsistencies.

To believe that Mr. Williams would permit the passage of such a law makes an unusual demand upon our credulity. The student of history who has made even a superficial examination of his character would hesitate to believe him guilty. In all of the writings that he has left he shows that he had a perfect comprehension of the difference between civil liberty and religious liberty, and in his "Letters"¹ he presents his views in the clearest manner, illustrating them, that they may be more explicit, by likening a commonwealth to a ship. Mr. Williams says:

"There goes many a ship to sea with many hundred souls in one ship, whose weal and woe is common, and is a true picture of a commonwealth as a human combination, or society. It hath fallen out sometimes that both Papists and Protestants, Jews and Turks may be embarked in one ship; upon which supposal I affirm, that all the liberty of conscience that ever I pleaded for, turns upon these two hinges—that none of the Papists, Protestants, Jews or Turks be forced to come to the ship's prayers or worship, nor compelled from their own particular prayer or worship, if they practice any. I further add that I never denied, that notwithstanding this liberty, the commodore of the ship ought to command the ship's course, yea, and also command that justice, peace and sobriety be kept and practiced, both among the seamen and all passengers. If any of the seamen refuse to perform their services, or passengers to pay their freight; if any refuse to help in person or purse, toward the common charges, or defence; if any refuse to obey the common laws and orders of the ship, concerning their common peace or preservation; if any shall mutiny and rise up against their commanders and officers; if any should preach or write that there ought to be no commanders nor officers, because all are equal in Christ, therefore no masters, nor officers, nor laws, nor orders, nor corrections nor punishments; I say I never denied but in such cases, whatever is pretended, the commander or commanders may judge, resist, compel and punish."

Here are definite opinions clearly defined. As Mr. Rider sums up the matter: "With him (Mr. Williams) it was clear that a person might be bound to support a civil government and at the same time remain in complete possession of his religious liberty, and yet not be an officer in the government." Still we are asked to believe that after preaching these tenets of perfect liberty the founder of the colony of Rhode Island put them into practice by

¹ p. 279.

demanding that the Papist, the Turk and the Jew should abjure their religious opinions and swear an oath professing Protestant Christianity before they should be permitted to enter the ship or the commonwealth.

As has been said, however, there is practically no truth in the charge. It is a mountain of misrepresentation with a single grain of fact as its foundation. As the manuscript records of the period are still in existence, perfect and unmutilated, it will not be a difficult matter to prove the truth of all the assertions that are now made.

The charge that the founders of the colony had no sooner obtained the charter from King Charles II., in which perfect religious liberty was guaranteed, than they proceeded to violate it by proscribing Roman Catholics, is believed to have originated with Mr. George Chalmers. On page 276 of his "Political Annals" (London, 1780), he says :

"Amidst the satisfaction occasioned by the obtention of the great object of the wishes of every one, an assembly composed agreeably to the Charter was convened in March, 1663. Among a great variety of ordinances which the circumstances of the colony required, and which were enacted, one for declaring the privileges of his Majesty's subjects is remarkable. It enacted that no freeman shall be imprisoned or deprived of his freehold or condemned but by the judgment of his peers or by the law of the colony; that no tax shall be imposed or required of the colonists but by the act of the General Assembly; that all men of competent estate and of civil conversation, Roman Catholics only excepted, shall be admitted freemen, or may choose or be chosen colonial officers." Mr. Chalmers, therefore, continues : "What abundant reflections does this ordinance afford to the wise ! Nothing is assuredly more incongruous than for a corporation created with special powers to endeavor by its own act to acquire privileges inconsistent with the patent which gave it existence. Yet that law plainly designed as its great charter is manifestly repugnant to the grant. By it none were at any time thereafter to be molested for any difference in 'matters of religion.' Nevertheless, a persecution was immediately commenced against the Roman Catholics, who were deprived of the rights of citizens and of the liberties of Englishmen."

On page 284, Mr. Chalmers says : "The act before mentioned excluding Roman Catholics from the privileges of freemen was carefully concealed. It ought to be remembered that the representatives of none of the colonial governments during those days, especially of those which talked the most of religion, are to be implicitly relied on." So stands Mr. Chalmer's charge, and it was

iterated and reiterated by the writers who followed him. Mr. Holmes, in his "Annals," says that such a law was enacted in 1653. The statement is repeated in the "Address to the Agricultural Society of Philadelphia," which was delivered by Mr. Rawle in 1818, and, during the same year, Mr. Verplanck alluded to it in his address before the New York Historical Society. Rhode Island's historian, Mr. Arnold, admits the fact and says: "The disabling clause had crept, no one knows how or when, in the act which defined the requisites of citizenship" (vol. ii., p. 490). Mention has already been made of the address that was delivered before the Pennsylvania Historical Society by Mr. Wallace, but, in 1873, while speaking before the same society, Mr. Craig Biddle said: "The mild and pious Roger Williams, who denounced the ecclesiastical tyranny of Massachusetts and fled into the wilderness to avoid its intolerance, does not appear to have been able to impress his views to their fullest extent on the province of Rhode Island, of which he was the founder, for, in the oldest printed copy of the laws now extant, the Roman Catholics are excepted from the enjoyment of freedom of conscience. It has been well said that intolerance formed a part of the very atmosphere of those times, and no one, not Luther or Calvin or Cranmer could escape its subtle infection."

These are but a few of the quotations that might be made. Since 1780, when Chalmers's statement was first given to the public, writers and speakers have been pleased to make use of these words as a means of attack on the reputation of Roger Williams, but as they may be said to represent the charge against him no more citations will be necessary.

If this law was passed at the session of 1653, however, it must have been with the knowledge if not the sanction of Mr. Williams. In 1636 he wrote the compact that stands in the first record book of the Colony, and he was actively interested in all legislative matters until 1677, when his political history ends. He was a member of the General Assembly in the term when the charter that is alleged to contain this proscription of Catholics, was accepted, and yet we shall show that he was entirely innocent of the charge with which he has so often been reproached.

After Mr. Chalmers's statement was made, it remained unquestioned until 1818, when Mr. Robert Walsh, Jr., began to doubt its authenticity. He referred the matter to United States Senator Burrill, and he forwarded the query to Judge Eddy, who was then Secretary of State of Rhode Island. Judge Eddy made a careful search of the records, and the result of his investigation appears on page 431 of "Walsh's Appeal." Here he says: "I have formerly examined the records of the State from its first settlement with a

view to historical information, and lately from 1663 to 1719 with a particular view to this law excluding Roman Catholics from the privileges of free men, and can find nothing that has any reference to it, nor anything that gives any preference or privileges to men of one set of religious opinions over those of another until the revision of 1745." Again in referring particularly to the session of 1663, Judge Eddy says: "The proceedings of this session are entire; there is not a word on record of the act referred to, purporting to have been passed at this session."

This throws a new light on the question, and demands the fullest investigation. No one can deny that this proscriptive clause appears in some of the printed "Digests of the Laws of Rhode Island," and that in these digests it is declared that the law was enacted in 1663. If this is not sure, when was the law enacted? and why does it appear under its false colors in the later digests? To answer these questions that naturally suggest themselves it will be necessary to follow in the footsteps of Judge Eddy and Mr. Rider, and refer to the legislative history of Rhode Island.

At various times since the institution of the Colony there have been published revisions of the laws of the Commonwealth. There is a manuscript digest of 1705. The first to be put in print bears the date of 1719, and it was in this book that the proscription clause first appeared. Mr. Rider holds that Judge Eddy was hampered in his investigations by the lack of available information. He explains: "Mr. Eddy refers to the digest of 1745 for the reason that he had never seen the previous digests of 1710 and 1719. He knew that there had been published a digest of 1719, and it may be that he brought his researches down to that year because of that fact."

However that may be, the two digests have now been found and may easily be examined. In the edition of 1719 the incriminating law appears as follows:

"Be it enacted by the General Assembly of this Colony and by the authority of the same it is hereby enacted that no Freeman shall be Taken and Imprisoned or be deprived of his freehold or liberty or free customs, or outlawed or exiled or otherwise destroyed, nor shall be passed upon, judged or condemned but by the lawful judgement of his peers, or by the law of this Colony, and that no Aid, Tax, Tailage or Custom, Loan, Benevolence, Gift, Excise, Duty or Imposition whatsoever shall be laid, assessed, imposed, levied, or required of, or on any of his Majesties subjects within this Colony, or upon their estates upon any manner of pretence or colour whatever, but by the Act and Assent of the General Assembly of this Colony.

"And no man of what estate and condition soever shall be put

out of his lands and tenements nor taken, nor imprisoned, nor disinherited nor banished, nor anyways destroyed, nor molested without being for it brought to answer by due course of Law; and that all rights and privileges granted to this Colony by his Majesties Charter be entirely kept and preserved to all his Majesties subjects residing in or belonging to the same; and that all men professing Christianity and of competent estates and of civil conversation who acknowledge and are obedient to the civil magistrate though of different judgements in Religious Affairs (*Roman Catholicks only excepted*) shall be admitted Freemen and shall have liberty to choose and be chosen Officers in the Colony both military and civil."

This law appears under the head of "Laws made and Past by the General Assembly of his Majesties Colony of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations in New England begun and held at Newport the first day of March, 1663."

The law appears, with but minor alterations, in the Digests of 1719, 1730, 1745 and 1767. In 1783 it was repealed by the General Assembly and at that time it was stated that the law had been enacted in 1663.

As we have now found a permanent foundation to work upon, by locating the law in the first printed Digest let us go back through the years when the laws existed only in the manuscript state. At the January session, 1704, a committee was appointed to prepare these laws that they might be printed. Another committee was appointed in June, 1705, "to view over and perfect said laws," and this manuscript, which is known as the Digest of 1705, is now on file at the office of the Secretary of State, but the incriminating law *does not appear in it*.

No other attempt to publish the laws was made until 1716 when the Assembly appointed a committee for this purpose. In 1717 another committee was appointed and in 1718 Richard Ward was authorized to "proceed to transcribe and fit the laws for the press *with marginal notes thereon*." This was done and the Digest of 1719 was printed, but, as Mr. Rider says: "There is no record of the enactment or re-enactment of the Digest of 1719 by the General Assembly. Hence it must follow that all propositions which had not, before the publication, been enacted in legal form and had become laws, did not by the fact of publication among genuine laws become themselves genuine. That there were cases of this kind is clearly proved by the action of the General Assembly at its very next (September) session. At that time it appointed a committee consisting of Governor Cranston, Lieutenant-Colonel William Coddington and Richard Ward to correct the errors of the press committed in printing the laws of the colony, and to get

them printed.¹ This extraordinary action shows two things: 1. That there were gross errors; 2. So gross, and so numerous as to justify the General Assembly in having the *errors* printed to accompany the genuine laws. I cannot discover that this project was carried out; if it was, no copy of the *errors* is known to exist.

As the Digest of 1719 was not confirmed, all of the additions were spurious, and, as the religious test for citizenship was but one of these annotations, it was not a law. The committee that was appointed to transcribe the laws had no legislative powers and no such act had ever been passed by the General Assembly.

The question that now arises is as to the cause that led the committee to make such an amendment. In 1665 it would have been clearly illegal, as at that time King Charles II. sent a commission to Rhode Island with five propositions. The second proposition was as follows: "That all men of competente estate and of civill conversation who acknowledge and are obediente to the civill magistrate though of differing judgements, may be admitted to be freemen and have liberty to choose and be chosen officers both civil and military." According to the *Rhode Island Colonial Record*² this was the law that was enacted in 1665 and not in 1663 as has been generally stated. The words *professing Christianity* and *Roman Catholics only excepted*, that were inserted without legislative authority in the Digest of 1719, did not appear in the proposition from the king, nor would he have permitted such a law to have been passed, as it would have been in conflict with the laws of England, and as Mr. Chalmers says: "The corporation had been empowered to make laws that should not be repugnant to the jurisprudence of England." Again, Blackstone says: "But it is particularly declared by statute³ that all laws, by-laws, usages and customs which shall be in practice in any of the plantations repugnant to any law, made or to be made in this Kingdom relative to the said plantation shall be utterly void and of none effect." Although it was the latter part of the eighteenth century before either Chalmers's or Blackstone's works appeared, the same law was in existence and had been provided for in the charter of the colony of Rhode Island.

This clause in the charter read that the power to make laws was conferred upon Rhode Island colonists, provided "such laws be not contrary, and repugnant unto, but as near as may be agreeable to the laws of the Realm of England." But this clause that made the proscriptive law positively illegal under the reign of Charles II., or in 1665, made its insertion actually compulsory in 1719.

At that time no Catholic could hold a seat in Parliament; they

¹ *R. I. Col. Rec.*, vol. iv, p. 257.

² Vol. ii, p. 112.

³ 7 and 8 Will 3, chap. 2.

were not permitted to inherit or purchase land, and none could enjoy any of the rights of citizenship unless they were Protestants.

The Rhode Island charter conferred upon every subject of the colony all the "Liberties and Immunities of Free and Natural Subjects, born within the Realm of England," but the hated Catholics who had no rights in England could not, by law, expect any better treatment in Rhode Island.

These anti-Catholic laws went into effect in England on June 24, 1716, but in the colonies the time was extended to the 24th of June, 1717. Here we have the story of the Digest of 1719. The laws of Rhode Island were in conflict with the laws of England and it would be necessary to revise the statute. In 1715 the committee was appointed and in 1719 the work was completed. Acting in harmony with the laws of England the committee had inserted the proscriptive clause and by an error of annotation the entire law, as it stood in the 1719 Digest, was credited to the session of 1663, while the mooted words "*professing Christianity*" and "*Roman Catholics only excepted*," had but recently and of necessity been inserted.

Yet these laws were never confirmed and not until 1830, when a new Digest was prepared, did the proscriptive clause go into effect, only to be repealed at the first opportunity. By an oversight the error of date remained unchanged and the characters of the broad-minded founders of the colony have therefore been attacked and besmeared by those careless writers and orators who did not take the trouble to investigate their assertions.

In Rhode Island, however, the proscription of Catholics was very different to what it was in England under the laws with which the Digest of 1716 was supposed to harmonize. Mr. Chalmers says: "Nevertheless a persecution was immediately commenced against the Roman Catholics, who were deprived of the rights of citizens and of the liberties of Englishmen." We have already shown that no such law existed in the colony until the laws of England made its enactment compulsory, as Rhode Island could not include the Roman Catholics in the list of freemen in the face of the direct demand of the charter, and we will now briefly consider the charge that the Catholics were persecuted in the colony and that their liberty of conscience was restricted. In his address before the Pennsylvania Historical Society, Mr. Biddle says: "In the oldest printed copy of its laws now extant, the Roman Catholics are excepted from the enjoyment of freedom of conscience."

In Rhode Island, on the contrary, the Catholics were received with the greatest favor permissible under the charter. According to the English statute, an English Catholic could not hold or inherit land; in Rhode Island a Catholic was permitted to hold land.

A Rhode Island Catholic who held property in England was compelled to forfeit it; in Rhode Island his right to his land was protected. In England he could have held no office, either civil or military; in Rhode Island any military office was open to him. In other words he was permitted to enjoy freedom of conscience and was only prevented from becoming a freeman by the laws of England. That is the persecution to which Catholics were subjected in Rhode Island. While Massachusetts and other colonies were acting in union against the Catholics and the Quakers the broad spirit of Roger Williams always remained as the predominating force in the colony, so that the oppressed of every faith and race were assured of a safe home if not a hearty welcome on the shores of Narragansett Bay.

JOHN RICHARD MEADE.

DE STVDIIS SCRIPTVRAE SACRAE.

VENERABILIBVS FRATRIBVS PATRIARCHIS PRIMATIBVS ARCHIEPISCOPIS ET EPISCOPIS VNIVERSIS CATHOLICI ORBIS GRATIAM
ET COMMVNIONEM CVM APOSTOLICA SEDE
HABENTIBVS LEO PP. XIII.
VENERABILES FRATRES SALVTEM ET APOSTOLICAM
BENEDICTIONEM.

PROVIDENTISSIMUS Deus, qui humanum genus, admirabili caritatis consilio, ad consortium naturae divinae principio exivit, dein a communi labe exitioque eductum, in pristinam dignitatem restituit, hoc eidem propterea contulit singulare praesidium ut arcana divinitatis, sapientiae, misericordiae suae supernaturali via patefaceret. Licet enim in divina revelatione res quoque comprehendantur quae humanae rationi inaccessae non sunt, ideo hominibus revelatae, *ut ab omnibus expedit, firma certitudine et nullo admixto errore cognosci possint, non hac tamen de causa revelatio absolute necessaria dicenda est, sed quia Deus ex infinita bonitate sua ordinavit hominem ad finem supernaturalem.*¹ Quae supernaturalis revelatio, secundum universalis Ecclesiae fidem, continetur tum in sine scripto traditionibus, tum etiam in libris scriptis, qui appellantur sacri et canonici, eo quod Spiritu Sancto inspirante conscripti, Deum habent auctorem, atque ut tales ipsi Ecclesiae traditi sunt.² Hoc sane de utriusque Testamenti libris

¹ Conc. Vat. sess. iii., cap. ii. de revel.

² Ibid.

perpetuo tenuit palamque professa est Ecclesia: eaque cognita sunt gravissima veterum documenta, quibus enuntiatur, Deum, prius per prophetas, deinde per seipsum, postea per apostolos locutum, etiam Scripturam condidisse, quae canonica nominatur¹, eandemque esse oracula et eloquia divina², litteras esse, humano generi longe a patria peregrinanti a Patre caelesti datas et per auctores sacros transmissas³. Iam, tanta quum sit praestantia et dignitas Scripturarum, ut Deo ipso auctore confectae, altissima eiusdem mysteria, consilia, opera complectantur, illud consequitur, eam quoque partem sacrae theologiae, quae in eisdem divinis Libris tuendis interpretandisque versatur, excellentiae et utilitatis esse quam maximae.—Nos igitur, quemadmodum alia quaedam disciplinarum genera, quippe quae ad incrementa divinae gloriae humanaeque salutis valere plurimum posse viderentur, crebris epistolis et cohortationibus provehenda, non sine fructu, Deo adiutore, curavimus, ita nobilissimum hoc sacrarum Litterarum studium excitare et commendare, atque etiam ad temporum necessitates congruentius dirigere iamdiu apud Nos cogitamus. Movemur nempe ac prope impellimur sollicitudine Apostolici muneris, non modo ut hunc praeclarum catholicae revelationis fontem tutius atque uberius ad utilitatem dominici gregis patere velimus, verum etiam ut eundem ne patiamur ulla in parte violari, ab iis qui in Scripturam sanctam, sive impio ausu invehuntur aperte, sive nova quaedam fallaciter imprudenterve moliuntur.—Non sumus equidem nescii, Venerabiles Fratres, haud paucos esse e catholicis, viros ingenio doctrinisque abundantes, qui ferantur alacres ad divinatorum Librorum vel defensionem agendam vel cognitionem et intelligentiam parandam ampliorem. At vero, qui eorum operam atque fructus merito collaudamus, facere tamen non possumus quin ceteros etiam, quorum sollertia et doctrina et pietas optime hac in re pollicentur, ad eandem sancti propositi laudem vehementer hortemur. Optamus nimirum et cupimus, ut plures patrocini divinarum Litterarum rite suscipiant teneantque constanter; utque illi potissime, quos divina gratia in sacrum ordinem vocavit, maiorem in dies diligentiam industriamque iisdem legendis, meditando, explanando, quod aequissimum est, impendant.

Hoc enimvero studium cur tantopere commendandum videatur, praeter ipsius praestantiam atque obsequium verbo Dei debitum, praecipua causa inest in multiplici utilitatum genere, quas inde novimus manaturas, sponsore certissimo Spiritu Sancto: *Omnis*

¹ S. Aug. *de civ. Dei*, xi, 3.

² S. Clem. Rm 1 ad Cor. 45; S. Polycarp ad Phil. 7; S. Iren. *c. haer.* ii, 28, 2.

³ S. Chrys. *in Gen. hom.* 2, 2; S. Aug. *in Ps.* xxx., *serm.* 2, 1; S. Greg. M. ad Theod. *ep.* iv. 31.

*Scriptura divinitus inspirata utilis est ad docendum, ad arguendum, ad corripiendum, ad erudiendum in iustitia, ut perfectus sit homo Dei, ad omne opus bonum instructus.*¹ Tali sane consilio Scripturas a Deo esse datas omnibus, exempla ostendunt Christi Domini et Apostolorum, Ipse enim qui miraculis conciliavit auctoritatem, auctoritate meruit fidem, fide contraxit multitudinem², ad sacras Litteras, in divinae suae legationis munere, appellare consuevit: nam per occasionem ex ipsis etiam sese a Deo missum Deumque declarat; ex ipsis argumenta petit ad discipulos erudiendos, ad doctrinam confirmandam suam; earumdem testimonia et a calumniis vindicat obtrectantium, et Sadducaeis ac Phariseis ad coarguendum opponit, in ipsumque Satanam, impudentius sollicitantem, retorquet; easdemque sub ipsum vitae exitum usurpavit, explanavitque discipulis redivivus, usque dum ad Patris gloriam ascendit.—Eius autem voce praeceptisque Apostoli conformati, tametsi dabat ipse *signa et prodigia fieri per manus eorum*,³ magnam tamen efficacitatem ex divinis traxerunt Libris, ut christianam sapientiam late gentibus persuaderent, ut Iudaeorum pervaciam frangerent, ut haereses comprimerent erumpentes. Id apertum ex ipsorum concionibus, in primis Beati Petri, quas, in argumentum firmissimum praescriptionis novae, dictis veteris Testamenti fere contexuerunt; idque ipsum patet ex Matthaei et Ioannis Evangeliiis atque ex Catholicis, quae vocantur, epistolis; luculentissime vero ex eius testimonio qui ad pedes Gamalielis Legem Moysi et Prophetas se didicisse gloriatur, ut armatus spiritualibus telis postea diceret confidenter: *Arma militiae nostrae non carnalia sunt, sed potentia Deo*.⁴—Per exempla igitur Christi Domini et Apostolorum omnes intelligant, tirones praesertim militiae sacrae, quanti faciendae sint divinae Litterae, et quo ipsi studio qua religione ad idem veluti armamentarium accedere debeant. Nam catholicae veritatis doctrinam qui habeant apud doctos vel indoctos tractandam, nulla uspiam de Deo, summo et perfectissimo bono, deque operibus gloriam caritatemque ipsius prodentibus, suppetet eis vel cumulator copia vel amplior praedicatio. De Servatore autem humani generis nihil uberius expressiusve quam ea, quae in universo habentur Bibliorum contextu; recteque affirmavit Hieronymus, ignorationem Scripturarum esse ignorationem Christi:⁵ ab illis nimirum extat, veluti viva et spirans, imago eius, ex qua levatio malorum, cohortatio virtutum, amoris divini invitatio mirifice prorsus diffunditur. Ad Ecclesiam vero quod attinet, institutio, natura, munera, charismata eius tam crebra ibidem mentione occurrunt, tam multa pro ea tamque firma prompta sunt argu-

¹ II. Tim. iii., 16-17.² S. Aug. *de util. cred.* xiv., 32.³ Act. xiv. 3.⁴ S. Hier. *de studio Script.* ad Paulin. *ep.* liii. 3.⁵ *In Is. Prol.*

menta, idem ut Hieronymus verissime edixerit: Qui sacrarum Scripturarum testimoniis roboratus est, is est propugnaculum Ecclesiae.¹ Quod si de vitae morumque conformatione et disciplina quaeratur, larga indidem et optima subsidia habituri sunt viri apostolici: plena sanctitatis praescripta, suavitate et vi condita hortamenta, exempla in omni virtutum genere insignia; gravissima accedit, ipsius Dei nomine et verbis, praemiorum in aeternitatem promissio, denunciatio poenarum.

Atque haec propria et singularis Scripturarum virtus, a divino afflatu Spiritus Sancti profecta, ea est quae oratori sacro auctoritatem addit, apostolicam praebet dicendi libertatem, nervosam victricemque tribuit eloquentiam. Quisquis enim divini verbi spiritum et robur eloquendo refert, ille, *non loquitur in sermone tantum, sed et in virtute et in Spiritu Sancto et in plenitudine multa.*² Quamobrem ii dicendi sunt praepostere improvideque facere, qui ita conciones de religione habent et praecepta divina enuntiant, nihil ut fere afferant nisi humanae scientiae et prudentiae verba, suis magis argumentis quam divinis innixi. Istorum scilicet orationem, quantumvis nitentem luminibus, languescere et frigere necesse est, utpote quae igne careat sermonis Dei,³ eandemque longe abesse ab illa, qua divinus sermo pollet virtute: *Vivus enim sermo Dei et efficax et penetrabiliter omni gladio ancipiti, et pertingens usque ad divisionem animae ac spiritus.*⁴ Quamquam, hoc etiam prudentioribus assentiendum est, inesse in sacris Litteris mire variam et uberem magnisque dignam rerum eloquentiam: id quod Augustinus pervidit diserteque arguit,⁵ atque res ipsa confirmat praestantissimorum in oratoribus sacris, qui nomen suum assidue Bibliorum consuetudini piaque meditationi se praecipue debere, grati Deo affirmarunt.

Quae omnia Ss. Patres cognitione et usu quum exploratissima haberent, nunquam cessarunt in divinis Litteris earumque fructibus collaudandis. Eas enimvero crebris locis appellant vel thesaurum locupletissimum doctrinarum caelestium,⁶ vel perennes fontes salutis,⁷ vel ita proponunt quasi prata fertilia et amoenissimos hortos, in quibus grex dominicus admirabili modo reficitur et delectetur.⁸ Apte cadunt illa S. Hieronymi ad Nepotianum clericum: Divinas Scripturas saepius lege, imo nunquam de manibus tuis sacra lectio deponatur; discere quod doceas . . . sermo presbyteri Scripturarum lectione conditus sit; convenitque

¹ In Is, liv. 12.

² I. Thess. i. 5.

³ Jerem. xxiii. 29.

⁴ Hebr. iv, 12.

⁵ De doct. chr. iv. 6, 7.

⁶ S. Chrys. in Gen. hom. 21, 2; hom. 60, 3; S. Aug. discipl. chr. 2.

⁷ S. Athan. ep. fest. 39.

⁸ S. Aug. serm. 26, 24; S. Ambr. in Ps. cxviii., serm. 19, 2.

⁹ S. Hier. de vit. cleric. ad Nepot.

sententia S. Gregorii Magni, quo nemo sapientius pastorum Ecclesiae descripsit munera: Necesse est, inquit, ut qui ad officium praedicationis excubant, a sacrae lectionis studio non recedant.¹ —Hic tamen libet Augustinum admonentem inducere, Verbi Dei inanem esse forinsecus praedicatorem, qui non sit intus auditor², eumque ipsum Gregorium sacris concionatoribus praecipientem, ut in divinis sermonibus, priusquam aliis eos proferant, semetipsos requirant, ne in insequentes aliorum facta se deserant.³ Sed hoc iam, ab exemplo et documento Christi, qui *coepit facere et docere*, vox apostolica late praemonuerat, non unum allocuta Timotheum, sed omnem clericorum ordinem, eo mandato: *Attende tibi et doctrinae, insta in illis; hoc enim faciens, et teipsum salvum facies, et eos qui te audiunt.*⁴ Salutis profecto perfectionisque et propriae et alienae eximia in sacris Litteris praesto sunt adiumenta, copiosius in Psalmis celebrata; iis tamen, qui ad divina eloquia, non solum mentem afferant docilem atque attentam, sed integrae quoque piaequae habitum voluntatis. Neque enim eorum ratio librorum similis atque communium putanda est; sed, quoniam sunt ab ipso Spiritu Sancto dictati, resque gravissimas continent multisque partibus reconditas et difficiliores, ad illas propterea intelligendas exponendasque semper eiusdem Spiritus “indigemus adventu,”⁵ hoc est lumine et gratia eius: quae sane, ut divini Psaltae frequenter instat auctoritas, humili sunt precatione imploranda, sanctimonia vitae custodienda.

Praeclare igitur ex his providentia excellit Ecclesiae, qua, *ne caelestis ille sacrorum Librorum thesaurus, quem Spiritus Sanctus summa liberalitate hominibus tradidit, neglectus iaceret*,⁶ optimis semper et institutis et legibus cavit. Ispa enim constituit, non solum magnam eorum partem ab omnibus suis ministris in quotidiano sacrae psalmodiae officio legendam esse et mente pia considerandam, sed eorundem expositionem et interpretationem in ecclesiis cathedralibus, in monasteriis, in conventibus aliorum regularium, in quibus studia commode vigere possint, per idoneos viros esse tradendam; diebus autem saltem dominicis et festis solemnibus fideles salutaribus Evangelii verbis pasci, restricte iussit.⁷ Item prudentiae debetur diligentiaequae Ecclesiae cultus ille Scripturae sacrae per aetatem omnem vividus et plurimae ferax utilitatis.—In quo, etiam ad firmanda documenta hortationesque Nostras, iuvat commemorare quemadmodum a religionis christianae initiis, quotquot sanctitate vitae rerumque divinarum scientia floruerunt, ii sacris in Litteris multi semper assidueque fuerint.

¹ S. Greg. M., *Regul. past.* II., 11 (al. 22); *Moral.* xviii., 26 (al. 14).

² S. Aug. *serm.* 179, 1.

³ S. Greg. M., *Regul. past.* III., 24 (al. 48).

⁴ I. Tim. iv., 16.

⁵ S. Hier., in *Mich.* I. 10.

⁶ Conc. Trid. sess. v, *decret. de reform.* 1.

⁷ Ibid., 1-2.

Proximos Apostolorum discipulos, in quibus Clementem Romanum, Ignatium Antiochenum, Polycarpum, tum Apologetas, nominatim Iustinum et Irenaeum, videmus epistolis et libris suis, sive ad tutelam sive ad commendationem pertinerent catholicorum dogmatum, e divinis maxime Litteris fidem, robur, gratiam omnem pietatis arcessere. Scholis autem catecheticis ac theologicis in multis sedibus episcoporum exortis, Alexandrina et Antiochena celeberrimis, quae in eis habebatur institutio, non alia prope re, nisi lectione, explicatione, defensione divini verbi scripti continebatur. Inde plerique prodierunt Patres et scriptores, quorum operosis studiis egregiisque libris consecuta tria circiter saecula ita abundarunt, ut aetas biblicae exegeseos aurea iure ea sit appellata.—Inter orientales principem locum tenet Origenes, celeritate ingenii et laborum constantia admirabilis, cuius ex plurimis scriptis et immenso Hexaplorum opere deinceps fere omnes hauserunt. Adnumerandi plures, qui huius disciplinae fines amplificarunt: ita, inter excellentiores tulit Alexandria Clementem, Cyrillum; Palaestina Eusebium, Cyrillum alterum; Cappadocia Basilium Magnum, utrumque Gregorium, Nazianzenum et Nysenum; Antiochia Ioannem illum Chrysostomum, in quo huius peritia doctrinae cum summa eloquentia certavit. Neque id praeclare minus apud occidentales. In multis qui se admodum probavere, clara Tertulliani et Cypriani nomina, Hilarii et Ambrosii, Leonis et Gregorii Magnorum; clarissima Augustini et Hieronymi: quorum alter mire acutus extitit in perspicienda divini verbi sententia, uberrimusque in ea deducenda ad auxilia catholicae veritatis, alter a singulari Bibliorum scientia magnisque ad eorum usum laboribus, nomine Doctoris maximi praeconio Ecclesiae est honestatus.—Ex eo tempore ad undecimum usque saeculum, quamquam huiusmodi contentio studiorum non pari atque antea ardore ac fructu vigit, vigit tamen, operâ praesertim hominum sacri ordinis. Curaverunt enim, aut quae veteres in hac re fructuosiora reliquissent deligere, eaque apte digesta de suisque aucta pervulgare, ut ab Isidoro Hispalensi, Beda, Alcuino factum est in primis; aut sacros codices illustrare glossis, ut Valafridus Strabo et Anselmus Laudunensis, aut eorundem integritati novis curis consulere, ut Petrus Damianus et Lanfrancus fecerunt.—Saeculo autem duodecimo allegoricam Scripturae enarrationem bona cum laude plerique tractarunt: in eo genere S. Bernardus ceteris facile antecessit, cuius etiam sermones nihil prope nisi divinas Litteras sapiunt.—Sed nova et laetiora incrementa ex disciplina accessere *Scholasticorum*. Qui, etsi in germanam versionis latinae lectionem studuerunt inquirere, confectaue ab ipsis *Correctoria biblica* id plane testantur, plus tamen studii industriaeque in interpretatione et explanatione collocav-

erunt. Composite enim dilucideque, nihil ut melius antea, sacrorum verborum sensus varii distincti; cuiusque pondus in re theologica perpensum; definitae librorum partes, argumenta partium; investigata scriptorum proposita; explicata sententiarum inter ipsas necessitudo et connexio: quibus ex rebus nemo unus non videt quantum sit luminis obscurioribus locis admotum. Ipsorum praeterea de Scripturis lectam doctrinae copiam admodum produnt, tum de theologia libri, tum in easdem commentaria; quo etiam nomine Thomas Aquinas inter eos habuit palmam.—Postquam vero Clemens V decessor Noster Athenaeum in Urbe et celeberrimas quasque studiorum Universitates litterarum orientalium magisteriis auxit, exquisitius homines nostri in nativo Bibliorum codice et in exemplari latino elaborare coeperunt. Reverta deinde an nos eruditione Graecorum, multoque magis arte nova libraria feliciter inventa, cultus Scripturae sanctae latissime accrevit. Mirandum est enim quam brevi actatis spatio multiplicata praelo sacra exemplaria, *vulgata* praecipue, catholicum orbem quasi compleverint: adeo per id ipsum tempus, contra quam Ecclesiae hostes calumniantur, in honore et amore erant divina volumina.—Neque praetereundum est, quantus doctorum viorum numerus, maxime ex religiosis familiis, a Viennensi Concilio ad Tridentinum, in rei biblicae bonum provenerit: qui et novis usi subsidiis et variae eruditionis ingeniique sui segetem conferentes, non modo auxerunt congestas maiorum opes, sed quasi munierunt viam ad praestantiam subsecuti saeculi, quod ab eodem Tridentino effluxit, quum nobilissima Patrum aetas propemodum rediisse visa est. Nec enim quisquam ignorat, Nobisque est memoratu iucundum, decessores Nostros, a Pio IV ad Clementem VIII, auctores fuisse ut insignes illae editiones adornarentur versionum veterum, Vulgatae et Alexandrinae; quae deinde, Sixti V eiusdemque Clementis iussu et auctoritate, emissae, in communi usu versantur. Per eadem autem tempora, notum est, quum versiones alias Bibliorum antiquas, tum polyglottas Antuerpiensem et Parisiensem, diligentissime esse editas, sinceræ investigandae sententiae peraptas: nec ullum esse utriusque Testamenti librum, qui non plus uno nactus sit bonum explanatorem, neque graviolem ullam de iisdem rebus quaestionem, quae non multorum ingenia fecundissime exercuerit; quos inter non pauci, iique studiosiores Ss. Patrum, nomen sibi fecere eximum. Neque, ex illa demum aetate, desiderata est nostrorum sollertia quum clari subinde viri de iisdem studiis bene sint meriti, sacrasque Litteras contra *rationalismi* commenta, ex philologia et finitimis disciplinis detorta, simili argumentorum genere vindicarint.—Haec omnia qui probe ut oportet considerent, dabunt profecto, Ecclesiam, nec ullo unquam providentiae modo

defuisse, quo divinae Scripturae fontes in filios suos salutariter derivaret, atque illud praesidium, in quo divinitus ad eiusdem tutelam decusque locata est, retinuisse perpetuo omnique studiorum ope exornasse, ut nullis externorum hominum incitamenti egerit, egeat.

Iam postulat a Nobis instituti consilii ratio, ut quae his de studiis recte ordinandis videantur optima, ea vobiscum communemus, Venerabiles Fratres. Sed principio quale adversetur et instet hominum genus, quibus vel artibus vel armis confidant, interest utique hoc loco recognoscere.—Scilicet, ut antea cum iis praecipue res fuit qui privato iudicio freti, divinis traditionibus et magisterio Ecclesiae repudiatis, Scripturam statuerant unicum revelationis fontem supremumque indicem fidei; ita nunc est cum Rationalistis, qui eorum quasi filii et heredes, item sententia innixi sua, vel has ipsas a patribus acceptas christianae fidei reliquias prorsus abiecerunt. Divinam enim vel revelationem vel inspirationem vel Scripturam sacram, omnino ullam negant, neque alia prorsus ea esse dictitant, nisi hominum artificia et commenta: illas nimirum, non veras gestarum rerum narrationes, sed aut ineptas fabulas aut historias mendaces; ea, non vaticinia et oracula, sed aut confictas post eventus praedictiones aut ex naturali vi praesensiones; ea, non veri nominis miracula virtutisque divinae ostenta, sed admirabilia quaedam, nequaquam naturae viribus maiora, aut praestigias et mythos quosdam: evangelia et scripta apostolica aliis plane auctoribus tribuenda.—Huiusmodi portenta errorum, quibus sacrosanctam divinorum Librorum veritatem putant convelli, tamquam decretoria pronuntiata novae cuiusdam *scientiae liberae*, obtrudunt: quae tamen adeo incerta ipsimet habent, ut eisdem in rebus crebrius immutent et suppleant. Quum vero tam impie de Deo, de Christo, de Evangelio et reliqua Scriptura sentiant et praedicent, non desunt ex iis qui theologi et christiani et evangelici haberi velint, et honestissimo nomine obtendant insolentis ingenii temeritatem. His addunt sese consiliorum participes adiutoresque e ceteris disciplinis non pauci, quos eadem revelatarum rerum intolerantia ad oppugnationem Bibliorum similiter trahit. Satis autem deplorare non possumus, quam latius in dies acriusque haec oppugnatio geratur. Geritur in eruditos et graves homines, quamquam illi non ita difficulter sibi possunt cavere; at maxime contra indoctorum vulgus omni consilio et arte infensi hostes nituntur. Libris, libellis, diariis exitiale virus infundunt; id concionibus, id sermonibus insinuant; omnia iam pervasere, et multas tenent, abstractas ab Ecclesiae tutela, adolescentium scholâs, ubi credulas mollesque mentes ad contempTIONem Scripturae, per ludibrium etiam et scurriles iocos, depravant

misere.—Ista sunt, Venerabiles Fratres, quae commune pastorale studium permoveant, incendant; ita ut huic novae *falsi nominis scientiae*¹ antiqua illa et vera opponatur, quam a Christo per Apostolos accepit Ecclesia, atque in dimicatione tanta idonei defensores Scripturae sacrae exurgent.

Itaque ea prima sit cura, ut in sacris Seminariis vel Academiis sic omnino tradantur divinae Litterae, quemadmodum et ipsius gravitas disciplinae et temporum necessitas admonent. Cuius rei causâ, nihil profecto debet esse antiquius magistrorum delectione prudenti: ad hoc enim munus non homines quidem de multis, sed tales assumi oportet, quos magnus amor et diuturna consuetudo Bibliorum, atque opportunus doctrinae ornatus commendabiles faciat, pares officio. Neque minus prospiciendum mature est, horum postea locum qui sint excepturi. Tuverit idcirco, ubi commodum sit, ex alumnis optimae spei, theologiae spatium laudate emênsis, nonnullos divinis Libris totos addici, facta eisdem plenioris cuiusdam studii aliquandiu facultate. Ita delecti institutique doctores, commissum munus adeant fidenter: in quo ut versentur optime et consentaneos fructus educant, aliqua ipsis documenta paulo explicatius impertire placet.—Ergo ingenii tironum in ipso studii limine sic prospiciant, ut iudicium in eis, aptum pariter Libris divinis tuendis atque arripiendae ex ipsis sententiae, conforment sedulo et excolant. Huc pertinet tractatus *de introductione*, ut loquuntur, *biblica*, ex quo alumnus commodam habet opem ad integritatem auctoritatemque Bibliorum convincendam, ad legitimum in illis sensum investigandum et assequendum, ad occupanda captiosa et radicitus evellenda. Quae quanti momenti sit disposite scienterque, comite et adiutrice theologia, esse initio disputata, vix attinet dicere, quum tota continenter tractatio Scripturae reliqua hisce vel fundamentis nitatur vel luminibus clarescat.—Exinde in fructuosiore huius doctrinae partem, quae de interpretatione est, perstudiose incumbet praeceptoris opera; unde sit auditoribus, quo dein modo divini verbi divitias in profectum religionis et pietatis convertant. Intelligimus equidem, enarrari in scholis Scripturas omnes, nec per amplitudinem rei, nec per tempus licere. Verumtamen, quoniam certa opus est via interpretationis utiliter expediendae, utrumque magister prudens devitet incommodum, vel eorum qui de singulis libris cursim delibandum praebent, vel eorum qui in certa unius parte immoderatus consistunt. Si enim in plerisque scholis adeo non poterit obtineri, quod in Academiis maioribus, ut unus aut alter liber continuatione quadam et ubertate exponatur, at magnopere efficiendum est, ut librorum partes ad interpretandum selectae

¹ I Tim. vi., 20.

tractationem habeant convenienter plenam: quo veluti specimine allecti discipuli et edocti, cetera ipsi perlegant adamantque in omni vita. Is porro, retinens instituta maiorum, exemplar in hoc sumet versionem vulgatam: quam Concilium Tridentinum *in publicis lectionibus, disputationibus, praedicationibus et expositionibus pro authentica* habendam decrevit,¹ atque etiam commendat quotidiana Ecclesiae consuetudo. Neque tamen non sua habenda erit ratio reliquarum versionum, quas christiana laudavit usurpavitque antiquitas, maxime codicum primigeniorum. Quamvis enim, ad summam rei quod spectat, ex dictionibus Vulgatae hebraea et graeca bene eluceat sententia, attamen si quid ambigue, si quid minus accurate inibi elatum sit, inspectio praecedentis linguae, suasore Augustino, proficiet.² Iamvero per se liquet, quam multum navitatis ad haec adhiberi oporteat, quum demum sit commentatoris officium, non quid ipse velit, sed quid sentiat ille quem interpretetur, exponere.³—Post expensam, ubi opus sit, omni industria lectionem, tum locus erit scrutandae et proponendae sententiae. Primum autem consilium est, ut probata communiter interpretandi praescripta tantò experrectiore observentur cura quanto morosior ab adversariis urget contentio. Propterea cum studio perpendendi quid ipsa verba valeant, quid consecutio rerum velit, quid locorum similitudo aut talia cetera, externa quoque appositae eruditionis illustratio societur: cauto tamen, ne intiusmodi quaestionibus plus temporis tribuatur et operae quam pernoscendis divinis Libris, neve corrogata multiplex rerum cognitio mentibus iuvenum plus incommodi afferat quam adiumenti.—Ex hoc, tutus erit gradus ad usum divinae Scripturae in re theologica. Quo in genere animadvertisse oportet, ad ceteras difficultatis causas, quae in quibusvis antiquorum libris intelligendis fere occurrunt, proprias aliquas in Libris sacris accedere. Eorum enim verbis, auctore Spiritu Sancto, res multae subiiciuntur quae humanae vim aciemque rationis longissime vincunt, divina scilicet mysteria et quae cum illis continentur alia multa; idque nonnunquam ampliore quadam et reconditiore sententia, quam exprimere littera et hermeneuticae leges indicare videantur: alios praeterea sensus, vel ad dogmata illustranda vel ad commendanda praecepta vitae, ipse litteralis sensus profecto adsciscit. Quamobrem diffitendum non est religiosa quadam obscuritate sacros Libros involvi, ut ad eos, nisi aliquo viae duce, nemo ingredi possit:⁴ Deo quidem sic providente (quae vulgata est opinio Ss. Patrum), ut homines maiore cum desiderio et studio illos perscrutarentur, resque inde operose perceptas mentibus animisque altius ingerent; intelli-

¹ Sess. iv. decr. de edit. et usu sacr. libror.

² De doctr. chr. iii. 4.

³ S. Hier. ad Pammach.

⁴ S. Hier. ad Paulin. de studio Script., ep. liii., 4.

gerentque praeipue, Scripturas Deum tradidisse Ecclesiae, quae scilicet duce et magistra in legendis tractandisque eloquiis suis certissima uterentur. Ubi enim charismata Domini posita sint, ibi discendam esse veritatem, atque ab illis, apud quos sit successio apostolica, Scripturas nullo cum periculo exponi, iam sanctus docuit Iranaeus:¹ cuius quidem ceterorumque Patrum doctrinam Synodus Vaticana amplexa est, quando Tridentinum decretum de divini verbi scripti interpretatione renovans, *hanc illius mentem esse declaravit, ut in rebus fidei et morum, ad aedificationem doctrinae christianae pertinentium, is pro vero sensu sacrae Scripturae habendus sit, quem tenuit ac tenet sancta Mater Ecclesia, cuius est iudicare de vero sensu et interpretatione Scripturarum sanctarum; atque ideo nomini licere contra hunc sensum aut etiam contra unanimem consensum Patrum ipsam Scripturam sacram interpretari.*²—Qua plena sapientiae lege nequaquam Ecclesia pervestigationem scientiae biblicae retardat aut coërcet; sed eam potius ab errore integram praestat, plurimumque ad veram adiuvat progressionem. Nam privato cuique doctori magnus patet campus, in quo, tutis vestigiis, sua interpretandi industria praeclare certet Ecclesiaeque utiliter. In locis quidem divinae Scripturae qui expositionem certam et definitam adhuc desiderant, effici ita potest, ex suavi Dei providentis consilio, ut, quasi praeparato studio, iudicium Ecclesiae maturetur; in locis vero iam definitis potest privatus doctor aequè prodesse, si eos vel enucleatius apud fidelium plebem et ingeniosius apud doctos edisserat, vel insignius evincat ab adversariis. Quapropter praecipuum sanctumque sit catholico interpreti, ut illa Scripturae testimonia, quorum sensus authentice declaratus est, aut per sacros auctores, Spiritu Sancto afflante, uti multis in locis novi Testamenti, aut per Ecclesiam, eodem Sancto adsistente Spiritu, *sive solemni iudicio, sive ordinario et universali magisterio*,³ eadem ipse ratione interpretetur: atque ex adiumentis disciplinae suae convincat, eam solam interpretationem, ad sanae hermeneuticae leges, posse recte probari. In ceteris analogia fidei sequenda est, et doctrina catholica, qualis ex auctoritate Ecclesiae accepta, tamquam summa norma est adhibenda: nam, quum et sacrorum Librorum et doctrinae apud Ecclesiam depositae idem sit auctor Deus, profecto fieri nequit, ut sensus ex illis, qui ab hac quoquo modo discrepet, legitima interpretatione eruatur. Ex quo apparet, eam interpretationem ut ineptam et falsam reliiciendam, quae, vel, inspiratos auctores inter se quodammodo pugnantes faciat, vel doctrinae Ecclesiae adversetur.—Huius igitur disciplinae magister hac etiam laude floreat oportet,

¹ C. haer. iv., 26, 5.

² Sess. iii., cap. ii., de revel.: cf. Conc. Trid. sess. iv., decr. de edit et usu sacro libror.

³ Conc. Vat. sess. iii., cap. iii., de fide.

ut omnem theologiam egregie teneat, atque in commentariis versatus sit Ss. Patrum Doctorumque et interpretum optimorum. Id sane inculcat Hieronymus¹, multumque Augustinus, qui, iusta cum querela, Si unaquaeque disciplina, inquit, quamquam vilis et facilis, ut percipi possit, doctorem aut magistrum requirit, quid temerariae superbiae plenius, quam divinorum sacramentorum libros ab interpretibus suis nolle cognoscere!² Id ipsum sentire et exemplo confirmavere ceteri Patres, qui divinarum Scripturarum intelligentiam, non ex propria praesumptione, sed ex maiorum scriptis et auctoritate sequebantur, quos et ipsos ex apostolica successione intelligendi regulam suscepisse constabat³.—Iamvero Ss. Patrum, quibus post Apostolos, sancta Ecclesia plantatoribus, rigatoribus, aedificatoribus, pastoribus, nutritoribus crevit⁴, summa auctoritas est, quotiescumque testimonium aliquod biblicum, ut ad fidei pertinens morumve doctrinam, uno eodemque modo explicant omnes: nam ex ipsa eorum consensione, ita ab Apostolis secundum catholicam fidem traditum esse nitide eminet. Eorundem vero Patrum sententiae tunc etiam magni aestimanda est, quum hisce de rebus munere doctorum quasi privatim funguntur; quippe quos, non modo scientia revelatae doctrinae et multarum notitia rerum, ad apostolicos libros cognoscendos utilium, valde commendet, verum Deus ipse, viros sanctimonia vitae et veritatis studio insignes, amplioribus luminis sui praesidiis adiuverit. Quare interpres suum esse noverit, eorum et vestigia reverenter persequi et laboribus frui intelligenti delectu.—Neque ideo tamen viam sibi putet obstructam, quo minus, ubi iusta causa adfuerit, inquirendo et exponendo vel ultra procedat, modo praeceptioni illi, ab Augustino sapienter propositae, religiose obsequatur, videlicet a litterali et veluti obvio sensu minime discedendum, nisi qua eum vel ratio tenere prohibeat vel necessitas cogat dimittere.⁵ quae praeceptio eo tenenda est firmitus, quo magis, in tanta novitatum cupidine et opinionum licentia, periculum imminet aberrandi. Caveat idem ne illa negligat quae ab eisdem Patribus ad allegoricam similemve sententiam translata sunt, maxime quum ex litterali descendant et multorum auctoritate fulciantur. Talem enim interpretandi rationem ab Apostolis Ecclesia accepit suoque ipsa exemplo, ut e re patet liturgica, comprobavit; non quod Patres ex ea contenderent dogmata fidei per se demonstrare, sed quia bene frugiferam virtuti et pietati alendae nossent experti.—Ceterorum interpretum catholicorum est minor quidem auctoritas, attamen, quoniam Bibliorum studia continuum quemdam progressum in Ecclesia habuerunt, istorum pariter commentariis suus tribuendus est honor, ex

¹ *Ibid.*, 6, 7.³ Rufin., *Hist. eccl.* ii., 9.⁵ *De Gen. ad litt.*, l. viii., c. 7, 13.² Ad Honorat., *de utilit. cred.*, xvii., 35.⁴ S. Aug. c. Iulian., ii., 10, 37.

quibus multa opportune peti liceat ad refellenda contraria, ad difficiliora enodanda. At vero id nimium dedecet, ut quis, egregiis operibus, quae nostri abunde reliquerunt, ignoratis aut despectis, heterodoxorum libros praeoptet, ab eisque cum praesentis sanae doctrinae periculo et non raro cum detrimento fidei, explanationem locorum quaerat, in quibus catholici ingenia et labores suos iamdudum optimeque collocarint. Licet enim heterodoxorum studiis, prudenter adhibitis, iuvare interdum possit interpret catholicus, meminerit tamen, ex crebris quoque veterum documentis¹, incorruptum sacrarum Litterarum sensum extra Ecclesiam neutiquam reperiri, neque ab eis tradi posse, qui, verae fidei expertes, Scripturae, non medullam attingunt sed corticem rodunt.²

Illud autem maxime optabile est et necessarium, ut eiusdem divinae Scripturae usus in universam theologiae influat disciplinam eiusque prope sit anima: ita nimirum omni aetate Patres atque praeclarissimi quique theologi professi sunt et re praestiterunt. Nam quae obiectum sunt fidei vel ab eo sequuntur, ex divinis potissime Litteris studuerunt asserere et stabilire; atque ex ipsis, sicut pariter ex divina traditione, nova haereticorum commenta refutare, catholicorum dogmatum rationem, intelligentiam, vincula exquirere. Neque id cuiquam fuerit mirum qui reputet, tam insignem locum inter revelationis fontes divinis Libris deberi, ut, nisi eorum studio usuque assiduo, nequeat theologia rite et pro dignitate tractari. Tametsi enim rectum est iuvenes in Academiis et scholis ita praecipue exerceri ut intellectum et scientiam dogmatum assequantur, ab articulis fidei argumentatione instituta ad alia ex illis, secundum normas probatae solidaeque philosophiae, concludenda; gravi tamen eruditoque theologo minime negligenda est ipsa demonstratio dogmatum ex Bibliorum auctoritatibus ducta: "Non enim accipit (theologia) sua principia ab aliis scientiis, sed immediate a Deo per revelationem. Et ideo non accipit ab aliis scientiis, tamquam a superioribus, sed utitur eis tamquam inferioribus et ancillis." Quae sacrae doctrinae tradendae ratio praeceptorem commendatoremque habet theologorum principem, Aquinatem:³ qui praeterea, ex hac bene perspecta christianae theologiae indole, docuit quemadmodum possit theologus sua ipsa principia, si qui ea forte impugnent, tueri: Argumentando quidem, si adversarius aliquid concedat eorum, quae per divinam revelationem habentur; sicut per auctoritates sacrae Scripturae disputamus contra haereticos,

¹ Cfr. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vii., 16; Orig. *de princ.* iv., 8; in *Levit. hom.* 4, 8; Tertull. *de praescr.* 15, seqq.; S. Hilar. Pict. in *Matth.* 13, 1.

² S. Greg. M. *Moral.* xx., 9 (al. 11).

³ *Summ. theol.*, p. i., q. i., a. 5 ad 2.

et per unum articulum contra negantes alium. Si vero adversarius nihil credat eorum quae divinitus revelantur, non remanet amplius via ad probandum articulos fidei per rationes, sed ad solvendum rationes, si quas inducit contra fidem.¹—Providendum igitur, ut ad studia biblica convenienter instructi munitique aggrediantur invenes: ne iustam frustrentur spem, neu, quod deterius est, erroris discrimen incaute subeant, Rationalistarum capti fallaciis apparatusque specie eruditionis. Erunt autem optime comparati, si, quâ Nosmetipsi monstravimus et praescripsimus via, philosophiae et theologiae institutionem, eodem S. Thoma duce, religiose coluerint penitusque perceperint. Ita recte incedent, quum in re biblica, tum in ea theologiae parte quam *positivam* nominant, in utraque laetissime progressuri.

Doctrinam catholicam legitima et sollerti sacrorum Bibliorum interpretatione probasse, exposuisse, illustrasse, multum id quidem est: altera tamen, eaque tam gravis momenti quam operis laboriosi, pars remanet, ut ipsorum auctoritas integra quam validissime asseratur. Quod quidem nullo alio pacto plene licebit universeque assequi, nisi ex vivo et proprio magisterio Ecclesiae; quae *per se ipsa, ob suam nempe admirabilem propagationem, eximiam sanctitatem et inexhaustam in omnibus bonis fecunditatem, ob catholicam unitatem, invictamque stabilitatem, magnum quoddam et perpetuum est motivum credibilitatis et divinae suae legationis testimonium irrefragabile.*² Quoniam vero divinum et infallibile magisterium Ecclesiae, in auctoritate etiam sacrae Scripturae consistit, huius propterea fides saltem humana asserenda in primis vindicandaque est: quibus ex libris, tamquam ex antiquitatis probatissimis testibus, Christi Domini divinitas et legatio, Ecclesiae hierarchicae institutio, primatus Petro et successoribus eius collatus, in tuto apertoque collocentur. Ad hoc plurimum sane conducet, si plures sint e sacro ordine paratiores, qui hac etiam in parte pro fide dimicent et impetus hostiles propulsent, induti praecipue armatura Dei, quam suadet Apostolus,³ neque vero ad nova hostium arma et praelia insueti. Quod pulcre in sacerdotum officiis sic recenset Chrysostomus: "Ingens adhibendum est studium ut *Christi verbum habitet in nobis abundanter*:"⁴ neque enim ad unum pugnae genus parati esse debemus, sed multiplex est bellum et varii sunt hostes: neque iisdem omnes utuntur armis, neque uno tantum modo nobiscum congredi moliuntur. Quare opus est, ut is qui cum omnibus congressurus est, omnium machinas artesque cognitatas habeat, ut idem sit sagittarius et funditor, tribunus et manipuli ductor,

¹ *Ibid.*, a. 8.

³ Eph. vi, 13, *seqq.*

² Conc. Vat., sess. iii., c. iii., *de fide*.

⁴ *Cfr.* Col., iii., 16.

dux et miles, pedes et eques, navalis ac muralis pugnae peritus: nisi enim omnes dimicandi artes noverit, novit diabolus per unam partem, si sola negligatur, praedonibus suis immissis, oves diripere."¹ Fallacias hostium artesque in hac re ad impugnandum multiplices supra adumbravimus: iam, quibus praesidiis ad defensionem nitendum, commoneamus.—Est primum in studio linguarum veterum orientalium simulque in arte quam vocant criticam. Utriusque rei scientia quum hodie in magno sit pretio et laude, eâ clerus, plus minusve pro locis et hominibus exquisita, ornatus, melius poterit decus et munus sustinere suum; nam ipse *omnia omnibus*² fieri debet, paratus semper *ad satisfactionem omni poscenti rationem de ea quae in ipso est spe*.³ Ergo sacrae Scripturae magistris necesse est atque theologos addecet, eas linguas cognitatas habere quibus libri canonici sunt primitus ab hagiographis exarati, easdemque optimum factu erit si colant alumni Ecclesiae, qui praesertim ad academicos theologiae gradus aspirant. Atque etiam curandum ut omnibus in Academiis, quod iam in multis receptum laudabiliter est, de ceteris item antiquis linguis, maxime semiticis, deque congruente cum illis eruditione, sint magisteria, eorum in primis usui qui ad sacras Litteras profitendas designantur.—Hos autem ipsos, eiusdem rei gratiâ, doctiores esse oportet atque exercitiores in vera artis criticae disciplina: perperam enim et cum religionis damno inductum est artificium, nomine honestatum criticae sublimioris, quo, ex solis internis, uti loquuntur, rationibus, cuiuspiam libri origo, integritas, auctoritas diiudicata emergant. Contra perspicuum est, in quaestionibus rei historicae, cuiusmodi origo et conservatio librorum, historiae testimonia valere prae ceteris, eaque esse quam studiosissime et conquirenda et excutienda: illas vero rationes internas plerumque non esse tanti, ut in causam, nisi ad quamdam confirmationem, possint advocari. Secus si fiat, magna profecto consequentur incommoda. Nam hostibus religionis plus confidentiae futurum est ut sacrorum authenticitatem Librorum impetant et discerpant: illud ipsum quod extollunt genus criticae sublimioris, eo demum recidet, ut suum quisque studium praeiudicatamque opinionem interpretando sectentur: inde neque Scripturis quaesitum lumen accedet, neque ulla doctrinae oritura utilitas est, sed certa illa patebit erroris nota, quae est varietas et dissimilitudo sentiendi, ut iam ipsi sunt documento huiusce novae principes disciplinae: inde etiam, quia plerique infecti sunt vanae philosophiae et rationalismi placitis, ideo prophetias, miracula, cetera quaecumque naturae ordinem superent, ex sacris Libris dimovere non verebuntur.—Congrediendum secundo loco cum iis, qui suâ physicorum scientia abusi, sacros

¹ *De sacerdot.*, iv. 4.² I. Cor., ix., 22.³ I. Petr., iii, 15.

Libros omnibus vestigiis indagant, unde auctoribus inscitiam rerum talium opponant, scripta ipsa vituperent. Quae quidem insimulationes quum res attingant sensibus obiectas, eo periculosiores accidunt, manantes in vulgus, maxime in deditam litteris iuventutem; quae, semel reverentiam divinae revelationis in uno aliquo capite exuerit, facile in omnibus omnem eius fidem est dimissura. Nimum sane constat, de natura doctrinam, quantum ad percipiendam summi Artificis gloriam in procreatis rebus impressam aptissima est, modo sit convenienter proposita, tantum posse ad elementa sanae philosophiae evellenda corrumpendosque mores, teneris animis perverse infusam. Quapropter Scripturae sacrae doctori cognitio naturalium rerum bono erit subsidio, quo huius quoque modi captiones in divinos Libros instructas facilius detegat et refellat.—Nulla quidem theologum inter et physicum vera dissensio intercesserit, dum suis uterque finibus se contineant, id caventes, secundum S. Augustini monitum, ne aliquid temere et incognitum pro cognito asserant.¹ Sin tamen dissenserint, quemadmodum se gerat theologus, summam est regula ab eodem oblata: Quidquid, inquit, ipsi de natura rerum veracibus documentis demonstrare potuerint, ostendamus nostris Litteris non esse contrarium; quidquid autem de quibuslibet suis voluminibus his nostris Litteris, idest catholicae fidei, contrarium protulerint, aut aliqua etiam facultate ostendamus, aut nulla dubitatione credamus esse falsissimum.² De cuius aequitate regulae in consideratione sit primum, scriptores sacros, seu verius Spiritum Dei, qui per ipsos loquebatur, noluisse ista (videlicet intimam adspectabilium rerum constitutionem) docere homines, nulli saluti profutura;³ quare eos, potius quam explorationem naturae recta persequantur, res ipsas aliquando describere et tractare aut quodam translationis modo, aut sicut communis sermo per ea ferebat tempora, hodieque de multis fert rebus in quotidiana vita, ipsos inter homines scientissimos. Vulgari autem sermone quum ea primo proprieque efferantur quae cadant sub sensus, non dissimiliter scriptor sacer (monuitque et Doctor Angelicus) ea secutus est, quae sensibilibus apparent⁴ seu quae Deus ipse, homines alloquens, ad eorum captum significavit humano more.—Quod vero defensio Scripturae sanctae agenda strenue est, non ex eo omnes aequae sententiae tuendae sunt, quas singuli Patres aut qui deinceps interpretes in eadem declaranda ediderint: qui, prout erant opiniones aetatis in locis edisserendis ubi physica aguntur, fortasse non ita semper iudicaverunt ex veritate, ut quaedam posuerint, quae nunc minus probentur. Quocirca studiose dignoscendum in illorum interpretationibus,

¹ *In Gen. op. imperf.*, ix., 30.

³ *S. Aug. ib.*, ii., 9, 20.

² *De Gen. add. litt.*, i., 21, 41.

⁴ *Summa theol.*, p. i. q. lxx. a 1 ad 3.

quaenam reapse tradant tamquam spectantia ad fidem aut cum ea maxime copulata, quaenam unanimi tradant consensu; namque in his quae de necessitate fidei non sunt, licuit Sanctis diversimode copulari, sicut et nobis, ut est S. Thomae sententia.¹ Qui et alio loco prudentissime habet; "Mihi videtur tutius esse, huiusmodi, quae philosophi communiter senserunt, et nostrae fidei non repugnant, nec sic esse asserenda ut dogmata fidei, etsi aliquando sub nomine philosophorum introducuntur, nec sic esse neganda tamquam fidei contemnendi doctrinam fidei praebeatur."² Sane, quamquam ea, quae speculatores naturae certis argumentis certam esse affirmarint, interpretes ostendere debet nihil Scripturis recte explicatis obsistere, ipsum tamen ne fugiat, factum quandoque esse, ut certa quaedam ab illis tradita, postea in dubitationem adducta sint et repudiata. Quod si physicorum scriptores terminos disciplinae suae transgressi, in provinciam philosophorum perversitate opinionum invadant, eas interpretes theologus philosophis mittat refutandas.—Haec ipsa deinde ad cognatas disciplinas, ad historiam praesertim, iuvabit transferri. Dolendum enim, multos esse qui antiquitatis monumenta, gentium mores et instituta, similiumque rerum testimonia magnis ii quidem laboribus perscrutentur et proferant, sed eo saepius consilio, ut erroris labes in sacris Libris deprehendant, ex quo illorum auctoritas usquequaque infirmetur et nutet. Idque nonnulli et nimis infesto animo faciunt nec satis aequo iudicio; qui sic fidunt profanis libris et documentis memoriae priscae, perinde ut nulla eis ne suspicio quidem erroris possit subesse, libris vero Scripturae sacrae, ex opinata tantum erroris specie, neque eâ probe discussa, vel parem abnunt fidem. Fieri quidem potest, ut quaedam librariis in codicibus describendis minus recte exciderint; quod considerate iudicandum est, nec facile admittendum, nisi quibus locis rite sit demonstratum: fieri etiam potest, ut germana alicuius loci sententia permaneat anceps; cui enodandae multum afferent optimae interpretandi regulae; et nefas omnino fuerit, aut inspirationem ad aliquas tantum sacrae Scripturae partes coangustare, aut concedere sacrum ipsum errasse auctorem. Nec enim toleranda est eorum ratio, qui ex istis difficultatibus sese expediunt, id nimirum dare non dubitantes, inspirationem divinam ad res fidei morumque, nihil praeterea, pertinere, eo quod falso arbitrentur, de veritate sententiarum quum agitur, non adeo exquirendum quaenam dixerit Deus, ut non magis perpendatur quam ob causam ea dixerit. Etenim libri omnes atque integri, quos Ecclesia tamquam sacros et canonicos recipit, cum omnibus suis partibus, Spiritu Sancto dictante, conscripti sunt; tantum vero abest ut divinae in-

¹ *In Sent.* ii., *dist.* ii., q. i., a. 3.

² *Opusc.* x.

spirationi error ullus subesse possit, ut ea per se ipsa, non modo errorem excludat omnem, sed tam necessario excludat et respuat, quam necessarium est, Deum, summam Veritatem, nullius omnino erroris auctorem esse.—Haec est antiqua et constans fides Ecclesiae sollemni etiam sententia in Conciliis definita Florentino et Tridentino; confirmata denique atque expressius declarata in Concilio Vaticano, a quo absolute edictum: *Veteris et novi Testamenti libri integri cum omnibus suis partibus, prout in eiusdem Concilii (Tridentini) decreto recensentur, et in veteri vulgata latina editione habentur, pro sacris et canonicis suscipiendi sunt. Eos vero Ecclesia pro sacris et canonicis habet, non ideo quod sola humana industria concinnati, sua deinde auctoritate sint approbati; nec ideo dumtaxat, quod revelationem sine errore contineant; sed propterea quod Spiritu Sancto inspirante conscripti, Deum habent auctorem.*¹ Quare nihil admodum refert, Spiritum Sanctum assumpsisse homines tamquam instrumenta ad scribendum, quasi, non quidem primario auctori, sed scriptoribus inspiratis quidpiam falsi elabi potuerit. Nam supernaturali ipse virtute ita eos ad scribendum excitavit et movit, ita scribentibus adstitit, ut ea omnia eaque sola quae ipse iuberet, et recte mente conciperent, et fideliter conscribere vellent, et apte infallibili veritate exprimerent: secus, non ipse esset auctor sacrae Scripturae universae. Hoc ratum semper habuere Ss. Patres: Itaque, ait Augustinus, quum illi scripserunt quae ille ostendit et dixit, nequaquam dicendum est, quod ipse non scripserit: quandoquidem membra eius id operata sunt, quod dictante capite cognoverunt²: pronunciatque S. Gregorius M.: Quis haec scripserit, valde supervacaneae quaeritur, quum tamen auctor libri Spiritus Sanctus fideliter credatur. Ipse igitur haec scripsit, qui scribenda dictavit: ipse scripsit qui et in illius opere inspirator extitit³. Consequitur, ut qui in locis authenticis Librorum sacrorum quidpiam falsi contineri posse existiment, ii profecto aut catholicam divinae inspirationis notionem pervertant, aut Deum ipsum erroris faciant auctorem. Atque adeo Patribus omnibus et Doctoribus persuasissimum fuit, divinas Litteras, quales ab hagiographis editae sunt, ab omni omnino errore esse immunes, ut propterea non pauca illa, quae contrarii aliquid vel dissimile viderentur afferre (eademque fere sunt quae nomine novae scientiae nunc obiciunt), non subtiliter minus quam religiose componere inter se et conciliare studuerint; professi unanimes, Libros eos et integros et per partes a divino aequae esse afflatu. Deumque ipsum per sacros auctores elocutum nihil admodum a veritate alienum ponere potuisse. Ea valeant universe quae idem

¹ Sess. ii., de revel.

² De consensu Evangel., l. i., c. 35.

³ Praef. in Iob., n. 2.

Augustinus ad Hieronymum scripsit: "Ego enim fateor caritati tuae, solis eis Scripturarum libris qui iam canonici appellantur, didici hunc timorem honoremque deferre, ut nullum eorum auctorum scribendo aliquid errasse firmissime credam. Ac si aliquid in eis offendero litteris quod videatur contrarium veritati, nihil aliud quam vel mendosum esse codicem, vel interpretem non assecutum esse quod dictum est, vel me minime intellexisse non ambigam¹."

At vero omni graviorum artium instrumento pro sanctitate Bibliorum plene perfecteque contendere, multo id maius est, quam ut a sola interpretum et theologorum sollertia aequum sit expectari. Eodem optandum est conspirent et connitantur illi etiam ex catholicis viris, qui ab externis doctrinis aliquam sint nominis auctoritatem adepti. Horum sane ingeniorum ornatus, si nunquam antea, ne nunc quidem, Dei beneficio, Ecclesiae deest; atque utinam eo amplius in fidei subsidium augescat. Nihil enim magis oportere ducimus, quam ut plures validioresque nanciscatur veritas propugnatores, quam sentiat adversarios; neque res ulla est quae magis persuadere vulgo possit obsequium veritatis, quam si eam liberime profiteantur qui in laudata aliqua praestent facultate. Quin facile etiam cessura est obtrectatorum invidia, aut certe non ita petulanter iam traducere illi audebunt inimicam scientiae, fidem, quum viderint a viris scientiae laude nobilibus summum fidei honorem reverentiamque adhiberi.—Quoniam igitur tantum ii possunt religioni importare commodi, quibus cum catholicae professionis gratia felicem indolem ingenii benignum Numen impertiit, ideo in hac acerrima agitatione studiorum quae Scripturas quoquo modo attingunt, aptum sibi quisque eligant studii genus, in quo aliquando excellentes obiecta in illas improbae scientiae tela, non sine gloria, repellant.—Quo loco, gratum est illud pro merito comprobare nonnullorum catholicorum consilium, qui ut viris doctioribus suppetere possit unde huiusmodi studia omni adiumentorum copia pertractent et provehant, coactis societatibus, largiter pecunias solent conferre. Optima sane et peropportuna temporibus pecuniae collocandae ratio. Quo enim catholici minus praesidii in sua studia sperare licet publice, eo promptiorem effusioresque patere decet privatorum liberalitatem; ut quibus a Deo aucti sunt divitiis, eas ad tutandum revelatae ipsius doctrinae thesaurum velint convertere.—Tales autem labores ut ad rem biblicam vere proficiant, insistant eruditi in iis tamquam principiis, quae supra a Nobis praefinita sunt; fideliterque teneant, Deum, conditorem rectoremque rerum omnium, eundem esse Scripturarum auctorem: nihil propterea ex rerum natura, nihil

¹ Ep. lxxxii., l. Et crurius alibi.

ex historiae monumentis colligi posse quod cum Scripturis revera pugnet. Si quid ergo tale videatur, id sedulo submovendum, tum adhibito prudenti theologorum et interpretum iudicio, quidnam verius verisimiliusve habeat Scripturae locus, de quo disceptetur, tum diligentius expensa argumentorum vi, quae contra adducantur. Neque ideo cessandum, si qua in contrarium species etiam tum resideat; nam, quoniam verum vero adversari haudquaquam potest, certum sit aut in sacrorum interpretationem verborum, aut in alteram disputationis partem errorem incurrisse: neutrum vero si necdum satis appareat, cunctandum interea de sententia. Permulta enim ex omni doctrinarum genere sunt diu multumque contra Scripturam iactata, quae nunc, utpote inania, penitus obsolescere: item non pauca de quibusdam Scripturae locis (non proprie ad fidei morumque pertinentibus regulam) sunt quondam interpretando proposita, in quibus rectius postea vidit acrior quaedam investigatio. Nempe opinionum commenta delet dies; sed veritas manet et invalescit in aeternum.¹ Quare, sicut nemo sibi arrogaverit ut omnem recte intelligat Scripturam, in qua se ipse plura nescire quam scire fassus est Augustinus,² ita, si quid inciderit difficilius quam explicari possit, quisque eam sumet cautionem temperationemque eiusdem Doctoris: Melius est vel premi incognitis sed utilibus signis, quam inutiliter ea interpretando, a iugo servitutis eductam cervicem laqueis erroris inserere.³—Consilia et iussa Nostra si probe verecundeque erunt secuti qui subsidiaria haec studia profitentur, si et scribendo et docendo studiorum fructus dirigant ad hostes veritatis redarguendos, ad fidei damna in iuventute praecavenda, tum demum laetari poterunt dignâ se opera sacris Litteris inservire, eamque rei catholicae opem afferre, qualem de filiorum pietate et doctrinis iure sibi Ecclesia pollicetur.

Haec sunt, Venerabiles Fratres, quae de studiis Scripturae sacrae pro opportunitate monenda et praecipienda, aspirante Deo, censuimus. Iam sit vestrum curare, ut qua par est religione custodiantur et observentur: sic ut debita Deo gratia, de communicatis humano generi eloquiis sapientiae suae testatius eniteat, optataeque utilitates redundant, maxime ad sacrae iuventutis institutionem, quae tanta est cura Nostra et spes Ecclesiae. Auctoritate nimirum et hortatione date alacres operam, ut in Seminariis, atque in Academiis quae parent ditioni vestrae, haec studia iusto in honore consistant vigeantque. Integre feliciterque vigeant, moderatrice Ecclesia, secundum saluberrima documenta et exempla Ss. Patrum laudatamque maiorum consuetudinem: atque talia ex temporum cursu incrementa accipiant quae vere sint in

¹ III Esdr., 4, 38.

² Ad Ianur. ep., lv. 21.

³ *De doct. chr.*, iii, 9, 18.

praesidium et gloriam catholicae veritatis, natae divinitus ad perennem populorum salutem.—Omnes denique alumnos et administratos Ecclesiae paterna caritate admonemus, ut ad sacras Litteras adeant summo semper affectu reverentiae et pietatis: nequaquam enim ipsarum intelligentia salutariter ut opus est patere potest, nisi remotâ scientiae *terrenae* arrogantia, studioque sancte excitato eius *quae desursum est* sapientiae. Cuius in disciplinam semel admissa mens, atque inde illustrata et roborata, mire valebit ut etiam humanae scientiae quae sunt fraudes dignoscatur et vitetur, qui sunt solidi fructus percipiat et ad aeterna referat: inde potissime exardescens animus, ad emolumenta virtutis et divini amoris spiritu vehementiore contendet: *Beati qui scrutantur testimonia eius, in toto corde exquirunt eum.*¹

Iam divini auxilii spe freti et pastoralis studio vestro confisi, Apostolicam benedictionem, caelestium munerum auspicem Nostraeque singularis benevolentiae testem, vobis omnibus, universoque Clero et populo singulis concedito, peramanter in Domino imperimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum die XVIII. novembris anno MDCCCXCIII., Pontificatus Nostri sextodecimo.

LEO PP. XIII.

[NOTE.—The official translation of this important encyclical and a commentary which is now preparing by a competent theologian, will appear in the April number of the REVIEW.—EDITOR.]

¹ Ps. xviii, 2.

Scientific Chronicle.

MONEY.

"Gold is the root of all evil,
Although it shines with a glittering hue;
It has caused many a lad to lose his part,
Whose mind and heart was e'er so true."—*Old Song*.

WE have not given the above quotation precisely as a specimen of the "sublime" in poetry (though truth is always one element of the sublime), nor yet as an example of remarkably good grammar; but we have given it—in the exact words in which we often heard it in our childhood—for the sake of the truth it contains.

"Gold" (meaning money) "is the root of all evil." Ah! is it, indeed? It seems, nevertheless, to have brought forth some good fruit, and a portion, at least, of the evil seems to be necessary evil, so that we must try to bear with it as best we may.

The Philosophers (with a big P, please) tell us that "man is born to live in society." With this proposition, rightly understood, we have no quarrel. From it radiate out, like the spines of an *echinus*, a host of consequences, some of greater, some of less importance.

The only one of them with which we have to do here is the necessity of *exchange of goods* between individuals and between communities.

Man is clearly a compound, being partly spiritual and partly material; and as he is not self-sufficing in either part, he has needs, as to both of his component parts, which only others can supply. In what follows we are dealing not with the question of his spiritual, but only of his material needs; and, indeed, with but one even of these, viz., the need of exchange of material goods between man and man.

From this point of view man needs, first of all, food; and, next, raiment and shelter. The primal, earthly source of all material goods is the inorganic deposit which exists in the earth itself and the organic products which it brings forth. But these cannot be procured and put into useful shape without labor. True, in some parts of the tropics one has but to stretch forth the hand and grasp the food already waiting; while the need of shelter is almost null, and the less said about "raiment," the better it is described. A fig-leaf will suffice for everyday wear; while for state occasions, the addition of an effete silk-hat, strayed or stolen from civilization, crownless or brimless though it may be, or a castaway shoe, worn as a hat, will lend lustre and dignity enough for a whole tribe. Labor there is scarcely needed and scarcely known. This, however, is the exception, and is applicable to only a very small part of the human race, and to the most degraded and savage part at that.

But, for the most part, the civilized man must work for the food which is to build up and maintain his bodily powers and for the raiment and shelter which are to defend him against the attacks of the elements. These are his real, natural, fundamental needs; whatever is beyond these is either supplementary to them or else is an artificial need or a downright luxury. Now it is a constant fact of history that the higher the degree of civilization (as the word is commonly used), the greater the number of these artificial needs, and the more urgent they become; so that after a comparatively short time they can scarcely be distinguished from real, genuine necessities. "Habit is a second nature" whose demands soon become nearly if not fully as imperious as those of her older sister, Number One. herself.

A principle underlying all that follows is what is called "the economy of labor." Suppose, as they do in the fairy tales, that a few hundred young persons were exiled to an uninhabited island. They are healthy and strong, but no one of them has yet learned a trade; the good *genius* of the place, however, is on hand and will give to each one whatever instruction in trades, arts, or sciences he may ask. Now if each one chose to be absolutely independent of all the others in everything, and consequently to be his own farmer, blacksmith, shoemaker, miller, baker, carpenter, mason, wheelwright, carder, spinner, weaver, tailor, metal-worker, clock- and watchmaker, artist, and a thousand other things, useful or ornamental, would there not be an immense waste of labor? Even if each one knew how to manufacture everything from a pin to a steam-engine, work, on the small scale of mere individual effort, could not be done or managed economically, and in many cases could not be done at all. But, say you, he would do his work by machinery. Yes, if he had the machines; but without the help of others he could neither "make the machines nor the machines that make them." Besides, what we have implicitly supposed above—viz., that in a lifetime one man could learn all the details of every trade and occupation—can be by no means granted. But, even supposing that there were time enough, no one ever has the universality of talent and taste necessary for the mastery of all trades theoretically, and much less practically. Men are not built that way, and we must take them as we find them.

There would, therefore, have to be a mutual helping on all hands; or, rather, some would have to practice one trade and some another; but each would work for the common good of all, in which, at the same time, his own greatest good would be included. The millers would have to grind for all, the shoemakers would have to make shoes for all, the farmers would have to farm for all, and so on of all the rest. Each one would have to give to all the others whatever they might need of the products of his industry and receive from them, in return, whatever he himself might need. This is *barter*, in its widest sense. In this mutual exchange of value for value, labor is economized and the greatest good of all secured. When our exiles have reached this stage they have become a community.

But now it may, and very often must, happen that the butcher will have supplied to the blacksmith and his family (heavy meat-eaters) a quantity of meat of greater value than that of the odd jobs which the blacksmith had done for him. What is to be done, then? Why, the blacksmith will probably be in the same predicament with respect to, say, the shoemaker, and the shoemaker with respect to the tailor, and so on through the various ramifications of the trades and manufactures. Naturally, then, they will swap off all around, each one giving what he does not, and receiving what he does need. If, even after this clearing-house operation, some have yet on hand more of a certain commodity than is needed by any one, they will try to preserve it till a demand arises.

This system of exchanging might answer for a small community, but when the community has become large, the very act of making the exchanges becomes a labor in itself; then some one takes this up as *his* trade and becomes a keeper of stores of goods, *i.e.*, a "storekeeper." He obtains his food and raiment by retaining a certain small portion for himself each time he effects an exchange; and this is perfectly just, since he labors for the good of others by doing a part of their necessary work. So far, it is barter pure and simple, in which an object of real value is exchanged for another of equal value.

How long this system prevailed among the sons and daughters of men we are not prepared to state, nor is it, except historically, a question of much moment. Certain it is, however, that at a pretty early date a better system was introduced, for we find it mentioned incidentally in the oldest documents extant, the Bible among others. It was crude, indeed, at first, but was much improved in the course of time, though it has its difficulties and dangers even yet, and they are giving the world a heap of trouble in these latter days—we mean the system of *buying and selling*, strictly so called; that is, of exchanging things of value for *money*.

In this system, instead of exchanging horses for herrings, lumber for lamp-shades, potatoes for planing-machines, bottles for boot-jacks, jack-knives for nightingales, books for broomsticks, pins for piano-fortes, and so on to the end of the unending list of things useful or useless, all of which entails a vast waste of labor, space, and time, some one (may his name, though unknown, be forever blest) struck upon the happy idea of substituting something which would *represent* value and which would be the go-between in the transferring of values, or which would be, in other words, the medium of exchange. This is money.

The word money is said to have been derived from the Latin word *monere*, to remind, whence *moneta*, a reminder, or money. The world would now be a great many per cent. better off if it had not forgotten the original meaning of the term, and the original office of the thing, money. It ought to *represent* value, be a *reminder* of value, but its own intrinsic value should have nothing to do with its value as a representative.

The intrinsic value of anything in this word depends on its power of

ministering to some need (taking that word in its very widest sense) of the individual or of the race. Everything which a man can make use of has, therefore, its own intrinsic value, which value depends on the properties and qualities of that thing.

A pound of beef or a peck of good potatoes (alas, how rare!) have a definite nutritive value, and no fluctuations of the money-market can ever alter that one jot or tittle. A yard of cloth has just so much covering power, and gold up or gold down will not change it. Gold, too, has its uses in the arts, and its value in them depends on its properties. A pound of it will serve to gild just so much surface to such a thickness. It will make a cup of just such a size, and the financial condition of the country or of the world will have no influence on its value for those or for similar purposes. The same is true of everything of which man makes use from the spider-web to the rhinoceros; from the cat's-tails of the swamp to the cedars of Lebanon; from the tadpole in the ditch to the telegraph-pole on the highway. They all have their values, differing in degree but not in kind, and therefore those values may all be represented by any arbitrarily chosen standard or medium of exchange.

That standard is called money. Gold has no exclusive right to hold that place, and, as a matter of fact, it has not always held it, nor does it hold it universally even now.

It has not always held it; for, silver, tin, lead, platinum, copper, brass, bronze, iron, nickel, potatoes, tobacco, hides, cattle, nails, silk, salt, tea, slaves, codfish, bullets, wampum, logwood, sugar, soap, leather, shells of mollusks, etc., have at different times and in different places been used as money. It must not be thought that when these things were used there was question of mere barter, for barter is essentially a free exchange on both sides to supply the actual wants of each, while these things were used for money, and as such were legal tender, and the creditor was obliged to accept them in payment of all debts, at the will of the debtor. A man might sell or not, as he pleased, but if he chose to sell, he must accept in payment the legal tender of the country. Gold did not, therefore, always hold the place of a standard.

It does not hold it universally now; for out of forty-one countries enumerated in the "Report of the U. S. Mint" for 1892, fourteen use gold alone as their standard; fifteen, silver alone, and twelve both gold and silver. Twenty-nine are therefore monometallist and twelve bi-metallist; but of this more anon.

To be theoretically perfect as a standard:

1. The medium of exchange should not be used for any other purpose.

2. It should be issued in proper quantities.

3. It should be practically indestructible.

4. It should be light, rather than heavy.

5. It should be exclusive.

These five points require some elucidation.

1. We have said that the medium of exchange should not be used

for any other purpose, for, to be true to its name, "Standard," it must *stand*. Its value must remain fixed. If it be used in the arts, its value will fluctuate according to the demand there is for it, and the demand will vary according to the whims, the fancies, the fashions of the passing hour. By depriving our standard of every other function except that of "medium of exchange," we rid ourselves at one stroke of a great cause of monetary troubles—that is, its fluctuations in value. But it may be objected that it would be impossible to do so. We shall see a moment later that it may be made possible.

2. It should be put forth in such quantities only as will suffice, but fully suffice for its sole object—*i.e.*, for a medium of exchange in all business transactions. The absurd phrase we hear so often now, "money-market," would disappear, and crises brought on by stringency or by looseness would be unknown. Can this be done? We shall see in good time.

3. The material of the standard should be practically indestructible. It will be handled by all sorts of hands, from those of the boarding-school miss, to those of the hard-handed sons of toil. It will be kept for long periods of time, under all sorts of conditions, favorable and unfavorable, and it must not wear away, nor rust, nor rot, nor undergo spontaneous disintegration. Hence, it should neither be too soft, nor too friable, nor too brittle; neither should it melt too easily, nor be liable to be destroyed by fire or water. These conditions exclude all organic substances such as wood, paper, tobacco, cabbages, etc., and many inorganic substances such as gems and quasi-precious stones; and many even of the metals, as lead, zinc, iron, tin, magnesium, antimony, mercury, and the whole list of the rarer metals and of the metalloids. About the only things left to choose from, therefore, are gold, silver, platinum, copper and aluminum. We shall discuss their respective merits presently.

4. It would be well, other things being equal, if the material of our standard were light rather than heavy. It has to be carried about a good deal, and to be transported from place to place in large quantities, and hence the lighter it is, within certain reasonable limits, the better. But this, though desirable, is not an essential requisite.

5. It should be exclusive—*i.e.*, there should be one standard, and but *one*. Here the monometallists and the bimetallicists begin to cross swords. The attempt to maintain two standards, each fluctuating according to its haps or mishaps at the mines, or according to the amount of rainfall on the meadows or sunshine on the hilltops, is radically wrong; and all efforts of legislators to fix the ratio *one to sixteen*, or *one to twenty*, or anything else, must end, as they have always ended, in dismal failure. This double standard idea has been, and is still, the ever-flowing source of "a sea of troubles," and will always be so unless our law-makers "take up arms and end it." To show this, let us make a comparison. In the noble art of tailoring, the yard is the standard of length. Now we expect to find that standard-unit the same every day of the year, and every year of the century; yea, for all time. No

matter how cloth, or ribbon, or gimcracks may vary in quantity or quality, the seller demands that the yard be always and everywhere a yard, and nothing more; the buyer just as emphatically demands that it be a yard and nothing less, and they both are right. It would be absolutely absurd to use any other unit of length as a standard unless it were a known, unvarying, aliquot part or multiple of that one. Gold and silver cannot be forced to bear such a relation to one another. Now, just as it is with the yardstick, so should it be with money; the standard should be one and invariable. If the relative values of commodities go up or down on account of their scarcity, or their abundance, or for any other reason, then let them go up or down, or sideways, if you like, but leave the unit of exchange severely alone.

Given, then, the five conditions, and we know of no other essential ones, our money system should be perfect.

Is this not, however, all mere Utopian longings, good enough to dream about, but unattainable in practice? We think not, but by means of the little scheme outlined below, we believe it could be easily and satisfactorily achieved.

The first thing to be done would be to select some one substance as a standard, and withdraw it completely and irrevocably from all use in the arts, so that it would have no market value. We ought to be ready and willing to make the sacrifice of one for the sake of the others, or rather for the sake of the trade, commerce and business transactions of the country, not to say of the whole world.

What substance shall that one be? We have already seen that about the only substances suitable for the purpose would be either gold, silver, platinum, copper or aluminum. As far as their inherent properties are concerned, any one of them would be fairly suitable. But other considerations, which we must examine in detail, spring up. Thus each of the first four has been, and is still so extensively used, and has become so necessary for all sorts of purposes that it could not well be taken. In the United States alone the amount of gold coined in 1892 was valued at \$35,500,000; the value of that used in the arts in 1891 was \$19,700,000, or considerably over one-third of the whole. The nominal value of the silver coined in 1892 was \$15,000,000; the value of that used in the arts in 1891 was \$9,600,000, again more than one-third of the total. This for one year, and it does not look so bad. What then? Shall we withdraw either this gold or this silver from the arts, and use it solely for money? You say no, and we say no, too, but for a stronger reason. What reason? The same, but more of it.¹

Let us look at this from another point of view. The amount of gold coin in the United States on July 1, 1892, was estimated at about \$700,000,000, and that of the silver coin at nearly \$500,000,000. The amount of these metals, however, stored away in jewelry, watches, plate, bric-a-brac, etc., must enormously exceed this, and cannot be esti-

¹ Oh, we forgot! The possible error committed by comparing the coinage of one year with the industrial concerns of another year was unavoidable, as we could not obtain the statistics of both. It does not matter much, however.

mated. Neither this gold nor this silver could by any possibility be called in. And, besides, the quantity of coin in existence increases very slowly, because when worn it is remelted and coined again, but this does not increase its quantity. On the other hand, the precious metal which has been once used in the arts, and has by that use received a value far beyond its intrinsic worth, will rarely return to the melting-pot, but the quantity so segregated will increase from day to day almost continuously; and this renders the difficulty of recalling it insurmountable.

Neither is copper nor platinum available. Copper is the basis of brass—and how could we get along without plenty of brass?—And both copper and platinum are absolutely necessary for electrical purposes. Every one of the four named has, then, been already too extensively applied to other uses to admit of its being recalled and set apart exclusively for the manufacture of money.

The only one left, therefore, is aluminum. With it, fortunately, the case is quite different. It has, or by alloying can be made to have, all the necessary qualities, as every one who understands its metallurgy will admit. But it is especially lucky in this, that it has not been so extensively used for other purposes as to be indispensable to them. Its withdrawal from the arts would occasion no great hardship, especially if done now. It would be manufactured by the government alone, and it would be made a misdemeanor, crime, felony (or what you please), to have any of the metal in one's possession. This ought to be no more onerous than the law we have now, which prohibits us, under a penalty of \$5000 fine and fifteen years' imprisonment at hard labor, from having in our possession any of the paper intended for the manufacture of our currency, or worse yet, any imitation of it. And yet, we, the people, for our own safety have enacted this law, and we pat ourselves approvingly on the back and think that we have done well. So we have; and if we call in all the aluminum of the country, and pass a like law for it, we may legitimately pat ourselves with both hands, for we shall have done a deed doubly good; for we shall have secured the triumph of monometallism, and made our standard of money absolutely invariable.

The only arguments that have any weight in favor of bimetallism are, first, that gold is too precious to be used for coins of low denominations; and, secondly, that there is not enough of gold in the world to go round; and that consequently it must be supplemented by silver. These arguments are convincing, so long as we are determined to remain in the chaotic condition of putting a market-value on gold and silver, and allowing that value to depend on an infinity of uncontrollable causes. This is standardizing our standard by a standard that cannot possibly be made to stand. What left-handed wisdom gone to seed!

But, with aluminum, in the plan which we suggest, no such difficulties could arise.

In the first place, it would be neither precious nor non-precious; or, it would be either precious or non-precious, according to the point of view. It would be precious as money (medium of exchange); precious

according to the inscription stamped on its face. Consequently, the smallest coin, the dollar say, could be made of any convenient size, as large as our present quarter for example; for lower denominations (fifty cents, twenty-five cents, fifteen cents, ten cents) give us back our dear old "shin-plasters," but make them, and always keep them, worth their face value, and no lying allowed. We need nickels for "fare, please," and the boys must have their 'pennies' for tossing and the girls theirs for candy and chewing-gum. These subsidiary coins are too insignificant to derange the plans of mice or men. The present paper currency is very convenient, and when kept up to the standard, as it could easily be when the standard itself is a real standard, it would be perfectly safe and would often be preferred to coin. If used for any other purpose than for coined money, aluminum, in the hands of any one except the government, would be legally non-precious; yea, verily, worthless; ay, more, a felony.

In the second place, there could always be aluminum enough to go round and to be held in reserve for emergencies; for, the supply of the raw material of which to make it is unlimited, and, when used for money only, the government could buy up the present aluminum plants, and, if necessary, extend them; and the metal could then easily be manufactured in sufficient quantities. With these two points settled, bimetalism would not have a leg left to stand on.

Another advantage would be, that counterfeiting would be rendered much more difficult than it is now. We can imitate pretty well the heaviness of gold, but it would be far more difficult to imitate the lightness of aluminum; and, besides, a man may now have any amount of gold and silver in his possession and no one can molest him; while, under the proposed aluminum plan, the possession of an ounce of the uncoined metal would be *prima facie* evidence of fraud and dishonesty. Hence the hazard of counterfeiting would become doubly great.

To bring about this change might take perhaps two or three years, and there need be no sudden shock, no derangement of business. As soon as each \$1,000,000 of aluminum money was ready, it could be put into circulation, and that much gold and silver coin retired, melted down, and transferred to industrial uses. Those who have stores of the quondam precious coins will be glad to get rid of them for something that is to be as immovable as the eternal hills, and those who have none—well, they will be no worse off than before, and no injustice or injury will be done to any one.

Let it be done now, and let King Al. reign over all before the end of this century. With him enthroned, all the difficulties arising out of past and present money-systems would vanish as mist before the rays of the morning sun.

But, now ariseth on the calm, still air the voice of the objector.

"All this," says he, "might do for one country if it were alone in the world. But we are not alone, and as 'man is born to live in society,' so the different nations must pull together. Other nations would not accept the substitute, and so the whole scheme would fail."

To this we answer, that it makes little difference to us whether other nations accept it or not. If they do, it is their gain; if they do not, it is their loss. But whether they do or not, neither our relations with them, nor their relations with us, would be deranged. But, the objection is that they would not accept, and on these lines it must be met.

Well, when foreign nations are our creditors and want gold or silver, we shall send it to them; and we can do this the more easily as there will now be more of it available. We shall not then expend, as we foolishly do now, a vast amount of labor on it, merely to put it into the shape of coin, afterwards to be melted down and recoinced under foreign dies. We shall buy it in bars from the refineries as we do now, weigh it out to them as Abraham did in his day, and send it to them for what it may be worth.

To pay our debts abroad, in 1892, we exported:

Gold (U. S. coin),	\$42,841,963
Silver (" "),	126,682
<hr/>	
Total coin exported,	\$42,968,645
But we received back again, in coin,	15,592,012
<hr/>	
Thus making the net export, in coin,	\$27,376,633
(Which probably went to the pot to be remelted.)	
Also, Gold (not in U. S. coin),	\$7,463,570
Silver (" " "),	33,773,880
<hr/>	
Total export, not coin,	\$41,237,450

Now, why could we not have paid, in uncoined metal, those twenty-seven odd millions just as well as we did the other forty-one millions? Foreign nations have no especial yearnings for the "Liberty-heads," "Spread-eagles," "Indian-heads," "Coats-of-arms," or "Stars" stamped on our pieces of money, and they are perfectly willing to take our gold and silver in hunks and chunks. Why then should we not be willing to let them have it just so?

When, on the contrary, foreign nations are our debtors we might accept either gold or silver, or anything else we could agree on; or, we might insist on getting aluminum, and its value, by weight, would correspond to the value of our coins, minus a percentage only just large enough to cover the cost of coinage. When shipped to individuals, it would be declared at the custom house, turned over to the government, and paid for by the latter on the spot.

But, a better plan would be to get the principal nations to adopt aluminum as the standard, fixed and unvarying the world over, in the same way as we have already proposed for our own country. Then, the weight of the coins could be made absolutely the same everywhere, and they would differ only in their images and superscriptions; the images being such as would suit the taste of each nation, and the superscriptions such as each people could pronounce without danger of spasms.

Under this plan, when money passed from one country to another, it

need not be recoined, but might be allowed to pass current there and everywhere else, just as well as at home.

The plan, then, is feasible. Who will take it up?

With our modern advances in the means of conveyance and of communication between distant lands, the bonds which unite different countries are being drawn closer and closer, and the necessity of some uniform system of exchange is making itself felt every day more and more.

The propitious time to set about establishing it is now, ere yet the last of the available metals has had such an attack of the "intrinsic-value" disease as to render it unfit to be the standard.

That metal is aluminum, and it seems almost providential that it has been kept in retirement so long, just as if it were waiting for the opportunity to come forth and fill the important post which it alone is fitted to fill.

Long live King Al!

T. J. A. FREEMAN, S. J.

THE SCIENCE OF MECHANICS.¹

THIS work is not, and was not intended to be, a text-book; nor is it a novel. It presupposes, in those who would take it up, a pretty fair knowledge of the ordinary college course of mechanics, and a good deal more than the mere desire to while away a leisure hour at the seaside. Neither is it a guide to the practical application of mechanical principles to machinery, nor yet a professedly mathematical development of those principles. From these stand-points we have plenty of treatises, and perhaps to spare, some good, some bad, some merely colorless.

The title of the present work has the somewhat rare merit of describing correctly not merely what the work professes to be, but what it really is—"a critical and historical exposition." It is historical, in the sense that it begins with the earliest records, and proceeds orderly downwards to the present time in such a way as to show the influence each set of ideas has had on the ones that came later. As to its being critical, no one, we fancy, who carefully reads its five hundred and twenty-one pages will have any doubts; one might perhaps be tempted to say that it is at times hypercritical. The foundations of the science are examined in detail, and, it must be said, with much cleverness.

While not denying the value of mathematical analysis, the author thinks, and we heartily agree with him, that it is well at times to look at the science of mechanics from its physical side also; especially as we find that the earliest investigators, those who may be said to have

¹ *The Science of Mechanics. A Critical and Historical Exposition of its Principles*, by Dr. Ernest Mach, Professor of Physics in the University of Prague. Translated from the German by Thomas J. McCormack.

laid its foundations, did, as a matter of fact, often have recourse to physical rather than to mathematical processes and explanations. Later developments have frequently proceeded in the opposite way; and this is well, too, but the starting point was, with good reason, physical. An example, taken from the book itself, will render clear what is here meant. Thus, if a chain were suspended over two pulleys, hanging loosely between them, what form would it take? The physical answer is that it would take on such a form as would bring its centre of gravity to the lowest possible point. The mathematical answer is simply the analytical equation of the curve.

In his Preface (page eight), the author puts forth an idea which he seems to claim as original, viz., that the office of science is "economy of thought," and the same idea is elaborated very fully towards the end of the book. We care little about priority of discovery, but the idea itself requires a word of explanation.

When, in the course of experimentation, we have solidly established some law, or when, in the process of reasoning—say on some mathematical problem—we have arrived at a general formula, we set that down, and, considering it as an acquired truth, we use it as a stepping-stone to further advances. That truth having been captured, we need not, when we have occasion to use the law or formula again, go over the steps of the process by which we first reached it; and even the steps themselves may no longer be present to our minds; but we have the result, and it would not be economy, but a waste of time and thought to reason ourselves every time, along the same old track again, from the same old beginning. To take an example: Suppose that a person has become convinced, as occasionally happens, that "in a right-angled triangle the sum of the squares on the sides about the right-angle is equal to the square on the hypotenuse." Now, if he intends to prosecute his studies much further, he will find that he will need this theory many a time later on in his mathematical life. Economy of thought in this case will consist in holding on to that theorem, without giving himself any further trouble about the process by which it was reached. So, in algebraic work, a single letter is sometimes used to represent the outcome of a long train of closely serried thoughts. The "*e*" of the Naperian logarithms is of this class.

Indeed, every experience gained and every formula obtained in the whole range of science, serves precisely this purpose, to be a round in the ladder by which to gain another round above. What matters it personally to the one who has gained a certain height if the rounds below be removed? Yet they must not, of course, be removed, nor should the one who is above pull the ladder up after him, for others are to mount also; and even the one who is already up must, especially if he be a teacher, descend time and time again to show his pupils the way, and lead them by the hand.

This principle of "economy of thought," is of special value to the *investigator* in all branches of science; but the experienced *teacher* well knows that it is better to be too lavish (within reasonable limits)

rather than too economical in his exposition of things scientific, while at the same time he will endeavor both by word and example to show his pupils how to economize the precious power of thought.

In the "Introduction" a distinction is pointed out between mechanical experience and mechanical science. No doubt, from the very dawn of the human race men learned how to aid their own feeble powers by means of mechanical devices and appliances. The pictures of ancient Egypt and Assyria show this, but as far as we can now ascertain, these appliances and devices were crude and imperfect. Scientific mechanics, in which the true theory of machines is explained, did not come to the front until a much later date.

But it is time to take a look at the "Science of Mechanics" in detail. The work before us is divided into five chapters.

Chapter I. treats of "The Development of the Principles of Statics," as applied to solids, liquids and gases.

Chapter II. treats of "The Development of the Principles of Dynamics," in which the names of Galileo, Huygens and Newton figure conspicuously.

Chapter III. treats of "The Extended Application of the Principles of Mechanics, and the Deductive Development of the Science."

Chapter IV. treats of "The Formal Development of Mechanics."

Chapter V. treats of "The Relation of Mechanics to the other Departments of Knowledge," specifically to physics and physiology.

The first sixteen pages of Chapter I. are devoted to the discussion of the lever. This is a very important matter, and we shall dwell on it rather more lengthily than on some other parts.

The father of scientific mechanics, Archimedes, of Syracuse, in Sicily (287-212 B. C.), in treating of this subject, lays down two principles which he seems to consider as self evident. They are:

"1. Magnitudes of equal weight acting at equal distances (from their point of support) are in equilibrium."¹

"2. Magnitudes of equal weight acting at unequal distances (from their point of support) are not in equilibrium, but the one acting at the greatest distance sinks."

From these assumptions he deduces the following proposition:

"3. Commensurable magnitudes are in equilibrium when they are inversely proportional to their distances (from the point of support)."

Concerning the truth of these propositions no one has the faintest shadow of a doubt; but what about their foundation? Is the first proposition really self-evident? Is it provable *à priori*? Or is it simply a fact ascertainable and ascertained only by experience?

If we have understood aright, we believe that most of the great investigators, among others, Leonardo da Vinci (1452-1519), Stevinus (1548-1642), Galileo (1564-1642), Huygens (1629-1695), Lagrange (1736-1813), have taken the first proposition either as self-evident, or

¹ Of course Archimedes meant the weights to act on opposite sides of the support, and in the same plane with it.

at least as a fundamental fact of experience; in either case, as incapable of further demonstration.

(The second proposition needs no special mention, since it is virtually contained in the first.)

The first having been admitted, these investigators, in imitation of Archimedes, applied themselves to the task of deducing the third. Our author, too, seems to admit the first proposition, on the ground of "instinctive perception," but he is not satisfied with the methods by which Archimedes and the others deduce the third. He believes that they have unconsciously relied on something which, to his mind, is more fundamental yet—*i.e.*, the principle of "*moments*." We know, of course, that by "moment" is meant the product of a force into the perpendicular let fall from the axis of rotation upon the line of direction of the force.

On pages twenty-one and twenty-two the author gives his own view of the case, saying: "That equilibrium exists if we lay a cord, subjected at both sides to equal tensions, over a pulley, *is perceived without difficulty*. . . . The motion that might be supposed possible cannot in this case be precisely determined or defined by any rule whatsoever; no motion will therefore take place." Just so. But this is not a whit more evident than is Archimedes' first proposition, and, from our own experience in teaching, we would be inclined to think it even less evident. It seems to have been brought in here merely to show the derivation of the concept of "*moments*." If this cord-over-a-pulley arrangement explains "*moments*," it is because "*we perceive without difficulty*" that there is equilibrium when the lever-arms are equal, and the forces (acting against each other) likewise equal. Now this is *precisely* Archimedes' first proposition. If the principle of moments be assumed as true, then Archimedes' principle follows; if Archimedes' principle be taken for granted, then the principle of moments (in the case of equal lever-arms) follows. Either one or the other *must be taken as an axiom (experimental or à priori)*; it matters little which, but we prefer that of Archimedes.

Now comes the deduction from the first to the third principle. We have said that in this Dr. Mach is satisfied with the methods neither of the ancients nor of the moderns. His own explanation is as follows: "Let us examine a so-called wheel and axle, of wheel-radius 2 and axle-radius 1, provided, respectively, with the cord-hung loads 1 and 2; an apparatus which corresponds in every respect to the lever of Archimedes. If, now, we place about the axle, in any manner we may choose, a second cord, which we subject, at each side, to the tension of a weight 2, *the second cord will not disturb the equilibrium*." After some reasoning, perfectly valid, from these premises, the author concludes thus: "The decisive factors are, then, the products of the weights into the respective perpendiculars let fall from the axis on the direction of the pulls; in other words, the so-called statical moments."

Now let us just refer back to the last words which we have italicized, "*the second cord will not disturb the equilibrium*." Certainly not, if we

admit Archimedes' first principle; otherwise it will. And, moreover, this explanation *supposes* that a wheel of radius 2 with weight 1, and axle of radius 1 with weight 2, "corresponding in every respect to the lever of Archimedes," is already in equilibrium before the second cord is applied; a supposition which is clearly a begging of the whole question. The good doctor must be joking.

No; give us Archimedes' first principle as "a highly imperative *instinctive perception*," and from this the full principle of the lever, including the principle of moments and the centre of gravity, can be deduced by the very demonstrations which Dr. Mach criticises and rejects. Afterwards, the mode of action of the other so-called mechanical powers, as the Inclined Plane, Screw, Pulley, Wheel-and-Axle, Toothed Wheel, and Wedge, can readily be deduced; and what more do we want?

The principle of the "composition of forces," as expressed in the law of the parallelogram of forces, comes up next for discussion. Stevinus arrives at this principle very ingeniously (for the case of forces at right angles to each other) by applying the principle of the inclined plane; but this method seems to be hardly fundamental enough to suit our author, and he refers to Newton and Varignon (more than a hundred years later) for a more convincing proof, but which he even still considers as derived from experience. Stevinus' deduction to the case of forces not at right angles to each other is, as the author states, not very clear. Taking for granted, however, the special case of forces at right angles as admitted, our author supplies what seems to be a perfectly clear and valid deduction to the general case.

"Daniel Bernoulli (1700-1782) was of opinion that the proposition of the parallelogram of forces was a *geometrical* truth independent of physical experience." Dr. Mach gives Bernoulli's proof, and then proceeds to find flaws and objections to no end, and finally picks it to pieces and scatters the fragments to the winds. We are strongly inclined to think that in this case the doctor is quite right, and we are content to leave the matter as it stands.

Nearly thirty pages are devoted to the discussion of "virtual velocities." The principle itself was first remarked by Stevinus in connection with his investigations on the equilibrium of pulleys. The conclusion to which his experiments led him was: "*Ut spatium agentis ad spatium patientis, sic potentia patientis ad potentiam agentis.*" Our way of expressing this is: "The power is to the weight as the space described by the weight is to the space described by the power." We stick to this faithfully. Yet in cases of equilibrium (with which statics properly deals) there are no motions, and therefore no spaces described, and therefore no velocities. Have we then lost our bearings? Not yet, for it must be remembered that a machine does not cease to be a machine because it happens to be at rest, and that the relations of its parts among themselves remain the same as when it is in motion. If, therefore, we make the smallest possible (infinitesimal) displacement at the power-end of a machine and see what displacement that causes at

the weight-end (resistance-end, work-end), we then shall know the relation between the power and the weight when the machine is at rest, and also the further, inverse relation of the spaces described when the machine is in motion. Now virtual velocities are not actual velocities (rates of motion), but merely the components, in the direction of the forces, of the displacements spoken of above.

After Stevinus, Galileo showed that the principle of virtual velocities (or virtual displacements) was applicable to the case of the inclined plane; Torricelli (1608-1647) connects it with the "centre of gravity," and John Bernoulli (1667-1748) showed its universal applicability to all cases of equilibrium.

James Bernoulli (1654-1705), Newton (1642-1726), Lagrange (1736-1813), and others have endeavored to get at the root of virtual velocities; but Dr. Mach, after duly reviewing and commenting on their labors, comes to the conclusion that there is in the principle simply the instinctive recognition of a fact; that fact being that heavy bodies, of *themselves*, move only downwards. This does, indeed, seem to bring it a little nearer to an instinctive perception, but at the same time it brings in the idea of *work*, which to most men can hardly be called instinctive; and, besides, it takes the question out of statics and transplants it in dynamics, where our readers will probably be very glad to leave it for the present.

The mechanics of liquids is next in order. Here, again, we find our old friend Archimedes to the fore. The story of his semi-accidental discovery of the principle of the loss of weight of bodies immersed in liquids, of his consequent absence of mind in regard to his toilet, and of his jubilant "*εὕρηκα, εὕρηκα*—I have found it, I have found it," as related by Vitruvius, is well known to all; then, starting from this fact of the buoyancy of liquids, he seeks to reason back to the cause, and, it must be said, succeeds fairly well; but we are not a little surprised to see it intimated that Archimedes knew of the sphericity of the earth.

As far as we know now, little more was done in the theory of hydrostatics till the 16th century, and by that time even the meaning of Archimedes' researches was lost. Stevinus, however, discovered, or rather rediscovered, by a method of his own, the most important principles of hydrostatics and the deductions therefrom; his experiments and demonstrations are still in use in our text-books on hydrostatics.

"Galileo endeavored to account for the equilibrium of liquids in connecting vessels (and the phenomena connected therewith) by the help of the principle of virtual displacements," but his method of applying the principle was erroneous, for he did not notice that any displacement of levels is accompanied by a displacement of the centre of gravity and a consequent destroying of the equilibrium. Indéed, Galileo seems to have had the knack of sometimes saying the right thing, but of half spoiling it by trying to bolster it up with irrelevant reasons; and this will be found, when the world has at last become honest, to have been the cause of all his well-known troubles.

Pascal (1623-1662), poor fellow, employs the same principle as Galileo

did; but by first making abstraction of the weight of the liquid, he manages to steer clear of Galileo's error. Still, Dr. Mach thinks that even he did not get down quite to bed-rock. His own view is that the idea of the transmission of pressure equally in all directions in a liquid is an immediate instinctive perception; yet we have often found it very difficult to get that *instinctive perception* into the minds of even very intelligent pupils. If animals have no instinct, but only reason (as modern pretended scientists would have us believe); and if men have no reason, but only instinct (as others, equally scientific, seem to hint); would it not be a wise thing for us to try and make some bargain with that more favored race of dogs and centipedes, looking towards a fairer division of the "honors?"

The mechanics of gases was totally unknown to the ancients. It was not until the seventeenth century that the physical properties of air were first systematically investigated, and though these investigations did not contribute much that was new to the science of mechanics, yet they gave a great stimulus to science generally.

The names most famous in these researches are those of Otto von Guericke (1602-1686), the sturdy Burgomaster of Magdeburg, the inventor of the air-pump; Evangelista Torricelli (1608-1647), who discovered atmospheric pressure; Blaise Pascal, who confirmed and extended Torricelli's discovery; Edmonde Mariotte (1620-1684) and Robert Boyle (1627-1691), who discovered, independently of each other, the law of the relation of volume to pressure.

The existence of other gases besides air was not known until the middle of the next century, but the principles of mechanics apply to them all, just as they do to liquids and solids if we but take into account their immensely greater compressibility.

We have reviewed this first chapter somewhat in detail, believing that the reader would thereby obtain a better idea of the author's ways and methods, than by skimming too lightly over the whole. From the rest of the book we shall merely signal out a few points in which especially we feel obliged to dissent from the author's opinions.

In spite of the lengthy argument by which he tries to show that Newton is wrong, and that there can be no such thing as "absolute" rotation, we are by no means won over, and the answers he makes to the objections of Streintz are to us anything but convincing. After all that has been said on the matter, is there anything unscientific in supposing the existence of a universe composed of only two bodies, A and B, both liquid? If they are at rest (call that rest absolute, or relative, or what you please), and if we neglect the slight deformation due to mutual attraction, both bodies will be spheres. If, now, A be made to rotate on an axis perpendicular to the line which joins the centres of A and B, the mere visual phenomena will be the same as if A were left at rest and B made to revolve in the opposite direction in the plane of the former equator of A. No sane mathematician will dispute this. The Doctor, however, will say that in either case there is only the relative motion of one body with respect to the other. This we deny. For, there is an-

other phenomenon which will not be the same under each of the suppositions. In the first case the body A will cease to be a sphere and become a spheroid, and every mathematician knows that this is demonstrated *entirely independently of the existence or non-existence of the body B*. In the second case, we know that the body A will not be deformed. This is proved (negatively), because no one can assign any reason why it should; and, positively, because the form of A is independent of the existence or non-existence, the presence or absence, and therefore of the position of B relatively to A. What does bring about the deformation in A is the centrifugal force due to its own real, absolute rotation, with which B has nothing whatsoever to do, so much so, that if B were to pass out of existence A would not be obliged to come to a halt and lose its spheroidal form, just for want of a companion to show 'off to. The counter-assertion, therefore, of Dr. Mach, that "when a body moves relatively to the fixed stars, centrifugal forces are produced; when it moves relatively to some different body and not relatively to the fixed stars, no centrifugal forces are produced," is simply untenable. And his triumphant question: "Can we fix Newton's bucket of water, rotate (he means revolve) the fixed stars, and *then* prove the absence of centrifugal forces?" is mere twaddle. We cannot, indeed, make the fixed stars revolve, but, if we have any sense, we can tell what would not happen, as far as this case is concerned, if we could make them revolve; and these are not "the arbitrary fictions of our imagination," but solid sense.

Neither can we admit that "there is no *cause* nor *effect* in nature," nor, "cause and effect are things of thought (merely)." If there are actions in the universe then there are causes, and if actions *do* anything then there are effects. If we place two square blocks in contact, on a rough table, and then push the first one in the proper direction, both blocks will move forward. Now it is simply idle, especially for a man who makes a boast of having got rid of "metaphysical obscurities," to say that the pressure of the hand is not the cause of the movement of the first block; and equally idle to say that the movement of the second block is not caused by the movement of the first, Paul Carus and his monism to the contrary notwithstanding. What takes place in the case of the blocks shows also that a thing may be cause with respect to one thing and effect with respect to others; and hence we are *instinctively* impelled to look back in all cases, if perchance we may find the prior cause. And this is precisely the office of true science, of all the sciences, each in its own sphere, to get back to the ultimate causes of whatever *is*. This is precisely what Dr. Mach has labored to do throughout his whole work on "The Science of Mechanics." Moreover, if there be no causes, the question which he asks (*passim*), in italics, too, "*Why?*" is not only idle, it is foolish; for, the answer must be, if the answer can be found, "B-e-c-a-u-s-e."

The second section of Chapter IV., entitled: "Theological, Animistic, and Mystical Points of View in Mechanics," should never have found a place in this work. No doubt some of the remarks are correct and

just, but others are false and calumnious. To say that Galileo was a "noble martyr to science," is demonstrably false, and the demonstration has been given so often that we are weary of it. To say that Giordano Bruno was a "noble martyr to science," is ridiculous. To say that "we have a long catalogue of the sins of the Church against progress," is a calumny. To say that "no engine was too base for the Church to handle against science," is ignorant biogtry. To criticise Euler for mixing, in his private correspondence with his pupil, theological, mathematical, and philosophical questions, is, to say the least, impertinence. We suppose that the plea on which these and similar assertions were admitted, is that they belong to the historical aspect of the subject. If so, they should first be true historically, and fair, critically; and this is by no means the case. And even if they were true they do not belong to the "History of Mechanics," and, therefore, to say the least, they are woefully out of place.

Apart from these blemishes the work is an excellent one, suggestive, full of thought, and showing signs of deep critical acumen, and is well worth a careful, studious, critical perusal. The work reads as smoothly as if it had been originally written in English, a merit which is often conspicuously absent in translations, and we have the testimony of Dr. Mach himself that the translation is accurate and faithful.

T. J. A. FREEMAN, S. J.

TRANSPARENT LEATHER.

The *Popular Science News*, quoting the *Magasin Pittoresque*, says that transparent leather may be manufactured as follows:

"After the hair has been removed from the hide the latter, stretched upon a frame, is rubbed with the following mixture:

	Parts.
"Glycerole (20° B.),	1000
Salicylic acid,	2
Picric acid,	2
Boric acid,	25

"Before the hide is absolutely dry it is placed in a room in which the rays of the sun do not penetrate, and is saturated with a solution of bichromate of potash. When the hide is very dry there is applied to its surface an alcoholic solution of torquoise shell, and a transparent aspect is thus obtained. This leather is exceedingly flexible. It is used for the manufacture of toilet articles, but there is nothing to prevent it from being used for foot-gear, and, perhaps, with fancy stockings, shoes made of it would not prove displeasing to the sight. They would at least have the advantage of originality."

As we have not yet had the opportunity to manufacture any of this leather, and as none of it has come to hand, we are still in the dark as to whether it is really transparent (like glass, for example), or only semi-

transparent, or merely translucent. If it be truly transparent will it, therefore, land us back again in the age of leather bottles? If so, we enter our protest right here against the "deadly picric acid." And, again, will not the "Cinderellas" become too numerous for the few "Princes" we have left?

But, speaking seriously, this leather-glass or glass-leather, if it can be made to stand the weather will be a grand thing for windows, skylights, green-houses, etc. . . . Who ever saw a skylight that didn't leak? Let us by all means have the transparent leather.

SUGAR FROM COTTON SEED.

"In Witu, East Africa, they are making sugar from cotton seed that is said to be fifteen times sweeter than that made from Louisiana sugarcane." So says the *Scientific American Supplement*.

We are not in the "Economical Science" business, but we cannot help remarking how the vaporings of Malthus and his crew dissipate themselves into nothingness, one by one. The human race was threatened with extinction because it was increasing so fast, that there would soon not be food enough to supply us all with a square meal even once a day. As we have just said, we are not in the economy business, and we are not going to plunge into the depths of that unfathomed gulf; we rise merely to remark that, just at the moment when the world is getting very sour, some one discovers a sugar fifteen times sweeter than what we had of yore. And so we are safe on that score for a long time to come. And so it will be with other things, when the real need arises. Be just and fear not, Malthusians, for God is not going to forget his own world yet awhile.

T. J. A. FREEMAN, S. J.

Book Notices.

MINIATURES FROM VATICAN MANUSCRIPTS. Edited and illustrated by Stephen Beissel, S. J. Containing documents for a history of the art of miniature. Freiburg un Breisgau: Herder. 1893. Folio, pp. 59, with thirty phototype plates. (Text in German and French.) Price, \$6.75.

The treasures of the Vatican archives seem inexhaustible. We receive at frequent intervals large consignments of documents, such as the *Regesta* of the Popes of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, volumes of nunciature reports of the sixteenth century, volumes of the general printed catalogues, etc. Within a short time a little army of writers like De Rossi, Ehrle, Muentz, Pflug-Harttung, de Volhac, Battifol, Carini, and others have written on the origin, vicissitudes, administration, and formation of the Pontifical archives. And yet they are, for the most part, no more than the papal records since the middle of the fifteenth century. Of all the preceding ages only a few volumes have been preserved; the internal dissensions of the city under Frederic II., the transfer of the papacy to Avignon, and the long absence from Rome of the central administration of Christendom, brought about the dispersion of the most marvelous and important collection of documents that the world has ever seen. Even the few ancient relics of the period before Innocent III. were poorly known and rarely seen until Leo XIII., by a munificent act, opened the archives to the scholars of all nations. Since then, not only great voluminous undertakings have made their appearance, but a daily increasing number of most interesting monographs on history, geography, politics, finance, art, and political economy, all of which present to the reader the fullest and most curious original information concerning the mediæval society. The work of Father Beissel is a notable example of this latter class. It presents a series of forty-three phototype miniatures in thirty plates, taken from Vatican manuscripts whose age varies from the fourth or fifth to the fifteenth century. Thus the average reader may form an idea of the elegant art of miniature as it was practised in Christian society, east and west, during a period of a thousand years. The plates, very beautiful in execution, are accompanied by a lengthy text which explains the history of these specimens of the miniaturist's art, and gives in detail interesting information concerning the coloring, design, grouping, draping, and other artistic minutiae.

In the brief space of sixty folio pages the writer has compressed a satisfactory account of the artistic decoration of many manuscripts, otherwise well-known to the learned world for their intrinsic value. Thus he passed in review three ancient Virgils and a Terence, written between the fourth and the ninth centuries, a tract on land surveying, probably of the fourth century, and the famous roll containing the book of Josue, which is over thirty feet in length and was copied, it seems, in the seventh century. With the Genesis Excerpts and the medical tract of Dioscorides at Vienna, and the Gospels of Rabulas at Florence, these are the oldest miniatures in existence, and are of incalculable value for the history of art in the early middle ages. Less subject to retouch and less accessible to vicissitudes of light and weather than

mural paintings, the miniatures have often come down in the exact state in which they left the hand of the original artist. It is easy to see how important the ancient ecclesiastical miniatures are for the details of Church art and architecture in the earliest period of Christianity. In fact, several of the details of the most ancient Virgils have a striking similarity to the frescoes of the Catacombs, and show us from what source and by what insensible transitions the traditions of classic art passed over into the Church circles.

Very interesting are the miniatures of the Greek and Latin manuscripts of the early Middle Ages. Father Beissel has selected several specimens from Latin gospels, calendars, sacramentaries, etc., which permit us to follow the evolution of the art of illuminating manuscript in the Carolingian epoch. Byzantine influence in coloring and composition and Nish influence in design and ornamentation are distinctly traceable in the illuminations of this period, as we might expect from what we otherwise know of the literary and religious movements which informed the contemporary culture.

Among the Vatican Greek manuscripts the *Topographia Christiana* of Cosmos Indicopleustes and the beautiful *Menologium* which furnished the text for the splendid edition of Cardinal Albani, show the skill of the Byzantine illuminator at its best. The pictures of the former are, unhappily, in too dilapidated a condition to permit successful photography, but the four hundred and thirty miniatures of the latter repay us for this loss, and in the abundant details of dress, furniture, and architecture bring before us a vivid picture of the Byzantine world under Basil II. († 1025). Another masterpiece of mediæval Greek art is the manuscript of the *Ladder of Paradise*, by John Climacus. Its accurate, portrait-like heads, the grace, vigor, and variety of its numerous miniatures compel the admiration of the beholder.

Out of the illuminated Vatican manuscripts of the later Middle Ages (eleventh to the fifteenth century) Father Beissel has selected a number of scriptural texts—a tract on the Crusades, the work of Frederic II. on falconry, a copy of the Decretals, some breviaries, the so-called Bible of Pinturicchio, a copy of the Divina Commedia, and some *Livres d'heures*. The great Bible of Farfa, an eleventh century manuscript, presents us with an admirable pictorial life of Christ in ninety-four scenes, placed before the section that contains the New Testament. The Old Testament is also liberally decorated, and the whole manuscript offers one of the most complete cycles of religious art, worthy of being ranked with the bronze column of Hildesheim, the four marble columns of St. Mark's, and the miniatures of the Gospel of Gotha. "The manuscript," says our author, "is one of the most important points of contact between the Carolingian and the Gothic art, and one of the best proofs of the steady evolution of that great branch of Italian art, which begins in the classic time and culminates in the Gothic."

The Italian artists, indeed, were henceforth the great masters of miniature, as is clearly proven by the magnificent illuminations of the Pinturicchio Bible. So perfect are these little gems of the painter's art that Séroux d'Agincourt attributed them to Perugino, Cosimo Roselli, or Pietro di Cosimo. This beautiful three-volume manuscript has a worthy rival in a contemporary copy of the *Divina Commedia*, the first half of which contains illuminations from the hand of an unknown Florentine, and the second half masterpieces of the celebrated Giulio Clovio. These precious books were written for popes, emperors, and kings, and have never been equalled in the annals of book-making. They are contemporary with the discovery of printing, an event which closed the career

of the mediæval illuminator, as far as the decoration of books was concerned.

The work of Father Beissel is a valuable contribution to the history of mediæval art. It is not so large or so costly as the great works of Comte Bastard or the facsimiles of Westwood and Gilbert, but it is conscientiously executed by a man who brings to his task the knowledge gained by numerous solid studies on mediæval art and architecture. It is at once modest and scientific, and can only confirm the reputation of its author. If read in connection with the easily-accessible works of Frantz on Christian Painting and Bayet on Byzantine Art, it will serve to increase the reader's veneration for those heroic pioneers of modern progress—the mediæval monks who handed down the torch of culture and learning from generation to generation, in times when such constant tradition of the fruits of the intellect was no easy task, as the quaint old copyist, Jonathan, tells us in a manuscript gospel of the eighth century:

Qui scribere nescit, nullum putet esse laborem.
Tres digiti scribunt, duo oculi vident,
Una lingua loquitur, totum corpus laborat,
Et omnis labor finem habet, et præmium ejus non habet finem.

T. J. S.

OLD AND NEW LIGHTS ON COLUMBUS. By *Richard H. Clarke, LL.D.* New York: Richard H. Clarke. 1893.

In the midst of the tributes paid to Columbus by all the nations, and especially by our own country, and in which Catholics have so cordially united, the well-timed book of Dr. Richard H. Clarke is another Catholic tribute. In this instance the homage is from the field or department of American Catholic history, and represents the moral, social, religious, and intellectual aspects from which American Catholics know and honor Columbus. Strange as it may seem, the very occasion of this great Columbian jubilee has been made the opportunity by some for questioning everything good which has been said of the great Catholic navigator, and of repeating everything bad which the tongue of calumny had uttered against him. It is difficult to understand the animosity with which the subject has recently been treated after four hundred years, or to admit the good taste of selecting the quadri-centennial celebrations for assailing the hero of the hour, and for offending the sensibilities of a grateful nation. At all events a vindication of Columbus from an American source had become a necessity, and we rejoice that the honorable task has been undertaken by a Catholic, and that the author should be one so well and favorably known to the American public, and especially to the Catholic portion of it, as is Dr. Clarke. It must have been to him a grateful task, for he was invited to it by the requests of eminent members of the Catholic hierarchy, clergy, and laity. It is a pleasure to say, after a careful perusal of the work, that it not only sustains but enhances the high reputation already won by Dr. Clarke as an historian, and that its execution, both in a literary and historical point of view, fully justifies the appeals made to the author to undertake it.

Of course, much of the book had to be given to the oft-repeated story of Columbus, but it is a story that never loses its charm and freshness. Sympathy between the author and his subject adds much to the interest with which the reading public receives a work. In this case the author is an admirer and eulogist of the illustrious mariner. To this circum-

stance is due, in a great measure, the success of the undertaking. Dr. Clarke discusses the controverted passages in the life of Columbus with a keen and sympathetic pen, and he relates the early and adventurous periods of the Admiral's career with a zest and ardor that give the charm of freshness to the career of a hero who had already a hundred biographers. Modern investigation has, however, added considerably to the success of this effort, and we find in the pages of this book the results of the most recent and learned research into the history of this remarkable man, concerning whose career so many controversies have taken place. Judge of this fact from the circumstances that as many as twenty-two places have claimed the honor of being his birth-place, and as many as five hundred portraits claim to be his genuine likeness. Dr. Clarke, following the great majority of writers and the preponderance of testimony, awards the honor to Genoa as the birth place of Columbus; and on the subject of portraits, as he has given in his book a very fine steel engraving of the Admiral, after the celebrated D'Orchi portrait, we presume he prefers this as the most authentic of the five hundred portraits. With all the old accounts well sifted and related, especially the Admiral's studies, his religious and Catholic zeal, his early sea-faring life, his enthusiasm, his rebuffs and disappointments, his ultimate successes and triumphs, his subsequent struggles, wrongs, and misfortunes, the ingratitude he received, his poverty, in fine, and his neglected death, there is ample new and valuable matter in the book to justify the attractive title of "*Old and New Lights on Columbus.*"

There are some portions of Dr. Clarke's book which invest it with peculiar interest and value. One of these is the powerful and convincing refutation of the calumny uttered by Harrisse and Winsor that Columbus, when he left Portugal for Spain, deserted his wife and his children (except Diego who accompanied him), and never saw them again. The manner in which the author disposes of this charge should cause it never to be uttered again. Again, and even more important, an entire chapter is devoted to the refutation of the charge that the relations of Columbus with Beatrix Enriquez were not sanctioned by marriage, and to the production of proofs of the legitimacy of his marriage with that lady. This part of the book is of intense interest. Perhaps it is liable to the criticism of being forensic rather than purely literary and historical, and it may read more like a lawyer's brief than an historical narrative. But at all events this chapter is replete with erudition drawn from every source, and gives a clear view of the canon law of the Church and of the civil law in their bearing upon the case of Columbus and Beatrix. But the literature of this chapter is as pleasing as the legal erudition is instructive. The parallel drawn in it between the case of Columbus and Beatrix and that of the Moor and Desdemona in Shakespeare's *Othello*, is a delightful episode that proves the historian to be skillful at producing a fine dramatic effect. We hope this able paper on the much-disputed question of the second marriage will effectually settle the controversy. There is also in Dr. Clarke's book a cogent and successful defence of Bishop Las Casas against the common charge of having been the originator of African Slavery in America. The account of the cause and manner whereby the New World was named America after Americus Vespucius instead of Columbia after Columbus, is equally interesting as it is instructive. These are some only of the "new lights" which Dr. Clarke has thrown upon the life of Columbus. It would be impossible for a book notice to give an adequate idea of this important contribution to literature. It is a work which no one will regret reading for himself, and thus judging of its merits.

MEDIÆVAL RECORDS AND SONNETS. By *Aubrey de Vere*. London: MacMullan & Co. 1893.

A new volume of poems from the veteran pen of Mr. De Vere, is always a welcome announcement to the lovers of poetry—but especially to the lovers of the Catholic muse. The present volume is meant to continue the author's illustration of Church-Epochs, the first instalment of which appeared a few years ago, under the title of *Legends and Records of the Church and the Empire*. However full of suggestion for poetic treatment was the early life of the Church, a richer field for such illustration is found in that mediæval period which furnished Kenelm Digby with the materials for his magnificent prose-poem, the *Mores Catholici*. Mr. De Vere gives us, in his preface, a rapid but elegant sketch of the influences that pervaded that epoch, and flowed from it down to the more modern progress which followed. The lofty ideals of those ages, symbolized in their architecture, painting, sculpture, but especially and best of all, in the flowering of the sweetest virtues, in that loyal devotion to throne and altar; that proud humility, that dignified submission to lawful authority—traits which our own age possesses in such slight degree—all this could surely suggest valuable matter for poems full of enduring interest and inspiration. It is needless to say, that Mr. De Vere has done his work well. He shows us how poetry, better than even fiction or history, can seize on the baffling elements of beauty in an event, or an epoch, and can crystallize them into a gem, which absorbs that beauty, only to intensify it in the reflection. As its title indicates, the volume is divided into two sections—the first, and by far the larger of which, is devoted to mediæval themes. "The Infant Bridal," published already, finds reprint here, because of its appropriateness to the general subject of the section—but its own beauty and interest could alone suffice for its insertion. "The True Humanity," the subject of much unfavorable comment, is also reprinted. The second section consists of twenty-four sonnets; and here, lovely tributes of admiration are paid to the memory of Newman, Manning, Brown-ing, Tennyson, and the hero of Molokai, Father Damien.

The reader of this volume will, perhaps, agree with us, that Mr. De Vere's greatest successes have been made in the two most difficult forms of verse in the language: the Heroic verse—"blank" verse, and the Sonnet. The former, without rhyme, requires an especially happy combination of force and dignity to invest it with a rhythm and cadence which still stands in lieu of the adornment of rhyme; the latter, revelling in rhyme, but rigidly unyielding in form, requires both a skilful selection of a theme which can be sufficiently exhausted in fourteen lines, and a ready adroitness in fitting the theme, naturally, into its strait-jacket of rhyme and metre. It is in these difficult forms that Mr. De Vere seems to be most at ease—an ease that is the result of laborious and thorough mastery of form and expression.

H. T. H.

GESCHICHTE DES ALTEN TESTAMENTS, mit besonderer Rücksicht auf das Verhältniss von Bibel und Wissenschaft von Dr. Aemilian Schöpfer: Brixen. 1893.

This learned work of the Tyrolese professor comes most opportunely to illustrate the Papal encyclical "On the Study of Scripture"; for though written before the appearance of the Pontifical document, it is thoroughly imbued with the spirit which Leo XIII. is anxious should inspire all the teachers of the candidates for the priesthood, viz., a profound reverence for the Word of God allied to a perfect acquaintance with the theories, hypotheses and opinions of the cultivators of natural science and the "higher criticism."

The object of the author is to write the history of the People of God before the coming of the Redeemer. This, of course, has often been done before ; but it is a history which must be rewritten at frequent intervals, owing to the ever-shifting attitude of the adversaries of revelation. There is a considerable amount of truth in the declaration which he quotes from that staunch defender of the faith, de Broglie: "It is high time that the Catholics should enter fully upon the momentous questions regarding the Pentateuch and the history of Israel. It is high time to defend a territory which is in imminent risk of being conquered by our enemies." The fact is that the Catholics, secure of their position, have looked on with perhaps too languid an interest whilst the heterodox of different degrees of heterodoxy have been wrangling among themselves, and whilst the "scientists" have been putting forth a thousand antagonistic theories, each one of which possessed but an ephemeral existence. Catholic theologians become intensely interested whenever an objection is presented to them which is tangible and substantial ; but they have scant desire to fight windmills and shadows. If our adversaries would say their last word on biblical subjects and let us know just where they stand, we could form our ranks to oppose them. But how can one "strike at them with a partisan," so long as, like Hamlet's ghost, they are here, they are there, they are gone. We are not trained to this guerrilla sort of warfare, and whilst not a few of our controversial writers have done some good service against the Rationalists, the majority of us have not taken the trouble to learn the merits of the quarrel. The generation succeeding us, however, will have to enter upon this combat, for Rationalism is growing into a science and is gradually sapping the foundations of revelation.

The present work, written for theological students, is admirably adapted to prepare the reader for the defence of the truth. The author has placed himself firmly upon the Catholic doctrine of the inerrancy of Holy Writ, and this position gives him the greater freedom in weighing the merits of whatever is advanced by unbelievers as fact or opinion. We need but quote his opening declaration of "guiding principles." 1. "There can be no antagonism between the *truth* of natural science and the *utterances* of Holy Writ. 2. Should such antagonism seem to exist, this is either *apparent* and will be dissipated by an accurate explanation of terms, or the fault will be found to lie either with the expounder of Scripture or with the expounder of natural truth. That is to say, either the biblical exegetist has without sufficient warrant pronounced his exposition the undoubted *sense* of Scripture, or the scientist has passed off as certain truth a mere hypothesis or subjective opinion. 3. Every exposition of Holy Writ which antagonizes an undeniable *fact* of nature cannot be the true sense inspired by the Holy Ghost, and must be abandoned. The ascertained results of the natural sciences (and their hypotheses too, if cautiously handled) are an excellent aid towards establishing the true sense of Scripture or at least towards rejecting false senses. 4. Any assertion of a scientist which stands in open contradiction to the true sense of Scripture, is false. 5. Many difficulties will vanish if we remember that Bible and Science view the self-same object from a different standpoint. Science is intent upon widening the horizon of natural knowledge and devotes itself to the study of secondary causes. Holy Writ is concerned with the salvation of human souls and seeks throughout the First Cause."

The learned author adheres faithfully to these Catholic principles all through his treatise. The present volume carries the sacred history down to the end of the Pentateuch. The author promises to publish the remaining portion within a year.

ELEMENTARY COURSE OF CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY BASED ON THE PRINCIPLES OF THE BEST SCHOLASTIC AUTHORS. Adapted from the French of *Brother Louis of Poissy* by the Brothers of the Christian Schools. New York: P. O'Shea. 1893.

It is no easy task to bring down philosophy to the intelligence of the uninitiated. Yet how can any one lay claim to the possession of an ordinary education who is ignorant of the art of reasoning, and of the fundamental truths regarding God, the world and the human soul? It is the most deplorable feature of modern systems of education that logic and metaphysics are either relegated to the most obscure and inferior position in the curriculum or are made conspicuous by their absence. They are in fact two branches of learning which demand such earnestness of study and such concentration of thought that they cannot fit into any system which aims only at skimming over the surface of things and shrinks from facing the problem of ultimate causes. If it be true that a superficial education is liable to lead men away from religion, it certainly becomes the duty of Christian teachers in these days of "universal enlightenment," or rather of universal presumption and self-conceit, to see to it that those who have been entrusted to them should not leave school without at least an elementary knowledge of the laws of reasoning, the criteria of certitude, the means of detecting sophistries, the limitations of material forces, the attributes of the human soul and of the Creator, and man's duties towards God, his neighbor and himself.

That the elementary knowledge of these supreme truths can be imparted within brief compass and in an easily intelligible manner is evidenced by a glance at the little book which lies before us. Brother Louis's treatise deserves all the encomiums which have been showered upon it by those whose commendation is most to be desired. The Supreme Pontiff, Pius IX., of happy memory, wrote the author a very flattering letter shortly after the appearance of the book; it was translated into Latin by a dignitary high in position at the papal court; and we can heartily endorse his words of praise. "Although charged during seventeen years," he says, "with the duty of teaching philosophy to young men, I shall never regret having undertaken this translation, because, in my opinion, there can be found in no other work anything more methodical, more exact, or more useful."

The book, in fact, aims at giving to beginners, in shape as popular as the subject-matter will admit, the essential principles of the good old philosophy of the scholastics, especially of the great leader of Catholic thinkers, St. Thomas Aquinas. Though a short abridgement of four important branches, Logic, Metaphysics, Natural Theology, and Ethics, it is by no means superficial or sketchy, but by an admirable economy of words and mastery of thoughts, it presents the outline of a *complete* course of philosophy, putting the student in position to fill up the outline by later and more exhaustive study.

We recommend the work to our high schools, academies and colleges, and also to those who, in various ways, are endeavoring to give to the less favored of our young men and women the advantages of university extension.

We must finally congratulate the publisher upon the typographical neatness of the book.

WETZER UND WELTE'S KIRCHENLEXICON. Second edition, 89th number. Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. 1893.

The latest number of this great work, which has engaged the collective labors of Catholic Germany for several years, brings the Lexicon down to the letter *N* and the beginning of the ninth volume. To say that this

Lexicon is indispensable to the Catholic student, being absolutely without a rival in any language, is to state its importance in the mildest terms. Would it not be advisable and feasible to issue a *Latin* edition of it? This might satisfy the large number of theological students who are unfamiliar with the German, biding the time when a similar work will issue from the Catholic University of America.

The present number contains an exhaustive and candid article by Felten on *Nepotism* and another by Funk on *Nestorius and the Nestorians*.

THE DAWN OF ITALIAN INDEPENDENCE: Italy from the Congress of Vienna, 1814, to the Fall of Venice, 1849. By *William Roscoe Thayer*. Two volumes. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1893.

The author has drawn his information chiefly from anti-Papal sources. If the tree is to be judged by its fruits, we doubt whether modern Italy should be regarded as redounding to the glory of the great "Liberators" and their methods. We hope our author will survive to correct many grave errors into which he has fallen.

LEHRBUCH DER DOGMATIK. Von *Dr. T. H. Simar, Bischof von Paderborn*. Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. 1893. Price \$3 85.

Another edition of this valuable treatise on Dogmatic Theology. Would that we possessed a similar work to put into the hands of educated English laymen! That a solid essay like this should have passed so soon into a third edition sufficiently demonstrates the need of and demand for such works.

INSTITUTIONES THEODICÆÆ, SIVE THEOLOGIÆ NATURALIS SECUNDUM PRINCIPIA S. THOMÆ AQUINATIS AD USUM SCHOLASTICUM. Accommodavit *Josephus Hontheim, S. J.* Freiburg and St. Louis: B. Herder. 1893. Price \$3.

An exhaustive treatise, in 831 pages, large octavo, on Natural Theology, grappling with all the questions, old and new, bearing on this very important subject.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

BLESSED GERARD MAJELLA, LAY BROTHER OF THE CONGREGATION OF THE MOST HOLY REDEEMER. A Sketch of his Life and the Many Wonderful Favors Obtained Through His Intercession. Translated from the Italian. With Portrait. Fr. Pustet & Co.: New York and Cincinnati.

VENERABLE MOTHER M. CAROLINE FRIESS—First Commissary-General of the School Sisters of Notre Dame in America: A Sketch of her Life and Character, by *P. M. Abbelin*, with an Introduction, by Rt. Rev. J. L. Spalding, D.D. St. Louis: B. Herder. 1893.

VADE MECUM. A Prayer- and Hymn-Book for Colleges, Academies and Sodalties. By a Father of the Society of Jesus. Fourth edition. B. Herder. 17 South Broadway, St. Louis. Price 45 cents.

THE ILLUSTRATED CATHOLIC FAMILY ANNUAL FOR 1894, with Calendars calculated for different parallels of latitude and adapted for use throughout the United States. New York: Catholic School Book Company.

70759

PERIODICAL

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

